JULY 1949 PRICE 1s. 3d. NET.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—Christianity and Fear—Personalism—Theism and Humanism—Martin Buber's 'I and Thou'—The Making of St John's Apocalypse . . 261

II. PONERON AND KAKON IN OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. By the Reverend W. F. Lofthouse, D.D., Woodstock, Oxford 264

III. LITERATURE 268

IV. DOCTRINE OF MAN: INDIVIDUALISM AND TOTALITARIANISM FULFIL EACH OTHER. By Father W. A. Cotton, House of the Resurrection, Mirfield, Yorks. . . . 275

V. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 278
2. The Christian Year 280

VI. EVANGELISM. By the Reverend James N. Alexander, M.A., Glasgow 286

VII. RECENT FOREIGN THEOLOGY. By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., Manchester . . 289

VIII. CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMENTS—
The Jews in the Fourth Gospel. By the Reverend G. J. Cuming, Burnley, Lancs . . 290
The Text of Luke xxiv. 34. By Professor Emeritus J. Hugh Michael, M.A., D.D., Emmanuel College, Toronto 292

VOLUME LX. No. 10

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH
EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your PRINTING and PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.

PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS

TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.

LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS

EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

Ministers and lay preachers need never be without topics and material if they subscribe to

"PULPIT PREACHING"

Particulars of which will be gladly sent (2d. stamp please) by the sole agents :—

THE RELIGIOUS BOOK SHOP
79 Reginald Street
Luton, Beds.

T. & T. CLARK

The following Titles are again available

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH
Dr. F. Schleiermacher — 25s. 6d. net
(English Translation by Prof. H. R. Mackintosh and Prof. J. S. Stewart)

OUTLINE OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY
Prof. W. N. Clarke — 18s. net

BIBLE STUDIES
Prof. G. A. Deissmann — 11s. 6d. net

NATURE OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE
Prof. N. Macleish — 6s. net

38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2

PSYCHOLOGY FOR MINISTERS AND SOCIAL WORKERS

By H. J. S. GUNTRIP, B.A., B.D.

The author is Psychotherapist at Leeds University Department of Psychiatry and Lecturer in Pastoral Psychology at Yorkshire United Independent College. The book seeks to give an account of some of the ways in which psychological knowledge can be used in helping men and women by those who are not specialists in psychotherapy but practical workers in the fields of religious and social service.

8/6 net

THE MIRROR OF GOD

By G. W. CAMERON-PRICE

The life of Jesus seen through the eyes of a disciple, written down as a letter and sent to a brother in Rome. A remarkable book which vividly represents the message and teaching of our Lord.

6/- net

A BOW AT A VENTURE

By ANGUS WATSON

"These forty-five short essays remind one of the pieces the late Lord Riddell used to publish for the edification of the young between the two wars. They are the wisdom of a brilliant man of business who has carved out a working philosophy for himself and is genuinely anxious to pass it on to others."
The Spectator.

8/6 net

FAITH STAKES A CLAIM

By LESLIE E. COOKE, B.A., B.D.

Twenty-one sermons given on ordinary and special occasions. Ministers and laymen will be anxious to see these little masterpieces from the hand of the Secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

6/- net

INTERNATIONAL CONGREGATIONALISM

By ALBERT PEEL, Litt.D.
and DOUGLAS HORTON, D.D.

The story of World Congregationalism from its beginnings up to the present day. A concise history of the past, a brilliant statement of the position to-day and the hopes of the future, specially published for reading before the Wellesley Conference.

5/- net

POSITIVE PREACHING AND THE MODERN MIND

By P. T. FORSYTH, M.A., D.D.

Another addition to the now impressive list of works by this great theologian. "*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind* will help in his task anyone who is willing to draw from the theology of Forsyth the conclusions which virtually affect his own preaching and hearing of the Word of God." —*Dr. Markus Barth.*

10/6 net

INDEPENDENT PRESS LTD.

MEMORIAL HALL, LONDON, E.C.4

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Theologians as well as preachers may profitably recall Carlyle's description of Coleridge as one who was 'constantly talking with solemn emphasis about matters of no great interest.' For while subjects like forgiveness or justification have perennial interest, an expert discussion of the mistaken views regarding them held by divines of the third or sixteenth or even nineteenth centuries may not deserve any more attention than it gets.

What to-day will engage more interest than old controversies will be any contribution made by a new approach to religious realities in the light of the discoveries of depth psychology. The Rev. Oscar Pfister, a Swiss minister of wide theological learning, who has combined with his pastoral duties in Zurich a large psychiatric practice, shows in his latest book, *Christianity and Fear*,[1] how profound and illuminating this contribution may be. One may prophesy that fresh life will be felt in the work of theologians who take pains to come to terms with Pfister's massive statement.

He holds that, without any detraction from its moral significance, the sense of guilt may be regarded as having the aspect of a neurosis, and should be examined, along with the religious means for its alleviation, in the light thrown by psychoanalysis on the causes and effects and cures of fear. A theology declining such an investigation deprives itself of essential insight. To undertake it involves no threat to genuine religious values, or to belief in the reality of Divine justice, grace, and love. Salvation will emerge in terms of psychological reality as the ending of estrangement and rebellion by a peace with God which releases the ethical activity of love.

His book accordingly begins with an elaborate study of fear, and of the defences raised against fear in fantasies and compulsion neuroses, in tabus and ritual, in laws and dogmas and devotional practices, and in evangelical faith. All of these defences against fear except the last in its pure form become themselves new provocations of the fear they mean to repel. This explains the ruthless punishment for the violation of a tabu, the anxious emphasis on legal and ceremonial detail, the hatred for the Nonconformist or the critic of orthodoxy, the ferocious persecution of heretics. These things are the reactions of uncontrollable terror against the sapping of the defences which have been erected against fear. The only defence that cannot become the occasion of new fear is the gospel of an absolutely loving God. 'Perfect love casteth out fear.' And this gospel works not by weakening the conscience but by purifying it by permeating it with Christian love.

Coming then to this gospel, Pfister focusses attention on the attitude of Jesus toward fear and its after effects and particularly toward the system of compulsions in Judaism. For Jesus the voice of conscience demanding loving action was the voice of God. Justice was part of love. No conflict was conceivable between true piety and ethics. This inward certainty constituted His prophetic authority, and determined His life and thought and work. Thus He broke with the rule of law that involved fear and compulsion, and so with Jewish orthodoxy, and substituted the gospel of a kind and merciful Father in heaven who forgives freely with an absolute love which operates without any polarization of justice and mercy.

This identification of the conscience that directs loving action with the voice of God means the identification of love and faith. Faith correctly understood is love reduced to an intellectual form. Love is the living practice of faith. There is no point at which love and faith can be dissociated. Love through faith is the same as faith through love, and to praise Christian morals while omitting the religious form Jesus gave them shows psychological ignorance.

Pfister brings his criticism to bear on Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and Roman Catholicism. 'The

[1] Allen and Unwin; 30s. net.

lamentations of the banished, the groans of the tortured, the screams and dying gasps of the innocents maimed and burned at his instance, raise a fearful accusation against the type of Christianity set up by Calvin, a Christianity frequently deprived of its deepest meaning and perverted by the operation of his fear and compulsion neurosis.'

The volume would bear revision to remove occasional repetitions and one or two meaningless sentences. The very competent translator must have toiled to produce so clear a version. On p. 195 'invested in' is not adequate; the sense is 'directed to be employed in.' And in several places the word 'grandiose' is used where its disparaging meaning is not intended. It would have added much to the usefulness of a book so full of valuable comment on places in the New Testament if an index of Scripture references had been given.

Personalism is a term that appears to have been used more on the Western than on the Eastern side of the Atlantic. It has been associated in particular with a certain form of theistic philosophy in which the conception of human personality provides the characteristic way of approach to ultimate reality. But Personalism may be used in a sense that does not necessarily imply a theistic philosophy, as humanism certainly is. And because of the continued tendency to set humanism in exclusive opposition not only to Christianity but even to theism, there is something to be said for a new use of the term Personalism. Under its shelter theists and humanists might well unite as upholders of the personal values in a world so dominated as ours is by philosophies of the naturalistic or even materialistic type.

Mr. J. B. Coates, Secretary of the Personalist Group in London, has recently written a book entitled *The Crisis of the Human Person*.[1] His sympathies are with theism rather than humanism in its narrower and exclusive sense, but he finds in Personalism a phrase that may include both theism and humanism and may serve to emphasise the united witness of theists and humanists to the significance of personal values in the world-view. He would describe Personalism as 'the name given to a number of varying forms of philosophical outlook of which the distinctive characteristic is that they correlate the conceptions of personality and value in conceiving personality as a unique entity in every human being which has a movement towards value and is the source of our knowledge of value.'

[1] Longmans; 12s. 6d. net.

In the light of such a description of Personalism he examines and appraises the standpoints of a number of modern writers, prefacing his treatment with an exposition of Personalism as advocated in the writings of Emmanuel Monnier, editor of 'Esprit' and founder of the contemporary Personalist Movement to which Mr. Coates is attached. The modern writers selected fall into three or four groups. First, Nicolas Berdyaev, Martin Buber, and Lewis Mumford, who are recognized as Personalists in the acceptation of the phrase in the Movement aforesaid. Then, Karl Mannheim, Harold Laski, and James Burnham, who are classed as neo-Marxists and subjected to criticism in the light of the positions which Mr. Coates has been led to adopt. Then, Gerald Heard, Aldous Huxley, and Arthur Koestler, who are classed as defeatists in their various ways; and, finally, Herbert Read, classed as an anarchist, though it is allowed that many of the political and social aims he has outlined are common to him and the Personalists.

But Mr. Coates' list of modern writers has not as yet been given in full. C. S. Lewis, who both attracts and repels him, receives a chapter to himself; while a comparison of the views of John Middleton Murry and William Reich on sexual issues, to which they both attribute great importance in modern life, serves to bring out the Personalist view of sex and marriage.

Martin Buber's name has been much canvassed among us in theological circles in the last decade (his book, 'I and Thou,' published about twenty years ago, was translated from the German in 1937); and we take the opportunity of giving here a short account of his views, as summarised by Mr. Coates, who does not confine his references to Buber to the chapter devoted to him.

We begin by quoting the following sentence: 'Martin Buber's "I and Thou" portrays perhaps with more brilliance and penetration than any other modern religious essay the experience of the man whose life gains significance by being based, not on instinct or knowledge, but on the living centre within himself which Buber calls the "I," the life of which depends on relationship, the relationship with significant form in nature, the relationship with other persons and the relationship with God.'

Thus we may view relationship, as essential to the 'I' or living centre within the self, under

three aspects. First, the relationship with significant form in Nature. This is a real relationship as compared with the 'I–It' relationship, which is between man and things, or between men and persons experienced as things. In the world of 'I–It,' which the scientist analyses, there is no mutuality, no action and reaction. The world does nothing to the experience, and the experience nothing to the world. But in the world of 'I–Thou' we enter into dynamic or living relationship with Nature, as Shelley did with the skylark, or Wordsworth with the green linnet. The significant form is there, even if man never finds it.

Secondly, the relationship with other persons. This is also a real relationship on which the 'I' depends. In this relationship a person is a 'Thou' who is experienced as a whole, and not as a mere collection of parts or bundle of qualities. And this form of experience is exclusive, so that when we say the word 'Thou' to a person he fills our world. That is, when we say it truly. The feelings that accompany the experience may vary, but it is the moment of exclusiveness that constitutes the reality of the experience.

Thirdly, the relationship with God. God is the eternal 'Thou,' that is, the 'Thou' which cannot become an 'It,' as Nature and other persons so generally are for us. It is through God, the eternal 'Thou' I find in myself as a power or presence, that real relationships come into being —with Nature, with other persons. There is no way of finding the reality of another person except through the eternal 'Thou' which exists in him. It is, however, wrong to say that we must find God in the depths of our own souls, as mysticism so often says. The eternal 'Thou' in oneself has no specific content. He who looks only into his own soul and does not seek to enter into relationships with others impoverishes his life, and soon even the God in his own soul deserts him.

'Some persons regard God as a being whom they infer, as from the order of nature or the purpose of evolution. However, we can only know God truly by knowing Him with the greatest possible closeness and directness in our lives and in our relationships.'

Other voices are raised among us to similar effect, but there is great ripeness and wisdom in the thoughts that follow in Buber's exposition, which combine mystical insight with a practical outlook. If the present tendency to depersonalize man is to be resisted, we should listen to teaching such as this of Buber's, that in so far as man becomes a creative 'I' responding to 'Thou' he rises superior to law and causation and all outward direction of his mind. 'The idea of controlling, by scientific knowledge, a world of creative "I's" is a manifest absurdity.'

Dr. Austin FARRER, Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, has, under the title, *A Rebirth of Images*,[1] published an elaborate study of the making of St. John's Apocalypse that should arouse much interest among critical students of the Bible. It is not only that the book shows an intimate and scholarly acquaintance with the Bible; it defends with great tenacity, if without dogmatism, the theory that St. John wrote the Apocalypse first and the Fourth Gospel afterwards and that he was not the apostle but the 'apostolical man' known to tradition as John the Elder.

We say 'without dogmatism,' for we observe that the author is willing to entertain the compromise with his theory that might be thus stated: 'The Apocalypse and Gospel are both, let us say, Ephesian books, the Gospel being written after the Apocalypse by one who knew it well and lived in the same thought-world, so that such images and ideas as seem to be taken up in the second work from the first have as likely as not been taken from it in fact.'

The primary point, therefore, according to this author, is that the Apocalypse preceded the Gospel and was before the mind of its writer. But he himself sees no reason for denying the unity of the two books, or for that matter the unity of the Johannine writings; the tradition is probably right in ascribing Apocalypse, Gospel, and Epistles to one writer.

The following quotation gives an indication of how Dr. FARRER would meet the objection based on the difference in style and content between the Apocalypse and the Gospel, and at the same time illustrates the tone (sometimes jaunty) of his exposition: 'If we ask, "Is the style of the Apocalypse that of the Gospel"? the answer is, plainly, "No." If we ask, "Is the attitude to the Advent Hope the same in the two works"? the answer is, again, "No." But since the style of the Apocalypse is completely artificial and antiquarian, to refuse to allow St. John ever to write in more ordinary speech is like refusing to recognize the authenticity of my everyday writings, because I once composed a collect in what I supposed to be the style of Archbishop Cranmer.'

[1] Dacre Press; 25s. net.

The quotation continues in much the same vein: 'And as for the attitude to the Advent Hope in Apocalypse and Gospel, let us get on to the time-machine, fly back to Patmos, and put our question to St. John himself, at work on his Revelation: "Are you not developing a somewhat one-sided eschatological emphasis?" "Let me be," the Saint replies. "I am making my meditation on the Last Things. I shall meditate on the Incarnation to-morrow."'

As for the Apocalypse itself, it is here contended that it is a single and living unity from end to end. And what is the clue to its unity? It is the lectionary of the Jewish synagogue of the First Century A.D. Through the pattern of the feasts and their lessons St. John views the Scriptures. Unfortunately there is much uncertainty about some of the festal lessons, especially those from the prophets; and Dr. FARRER has been content to build upon the agreed points, leaving it to others to weave the texts as a whole into the lectionary pattern. He expects that the Talmudists may call his work 'unscholarly,' but he hopes they may find something in it they can use.

It should be obvious that Dr. FARRER sets his readers no easy task if they are to follow and check at every stage an exposition of the unity of what is on the face of it a book of great complexity. He finds that the images are bound to one another by 'a delicate web of interrelated significance,' and yet the impression the Apocalypse leaves on the mind is apt to be that of a jumble and confusion of images. And he does little to make his exposition easier than a clear and pointed style of writing can make it. True, it is divided into chapters, and the headings of the chapters (The Sevenfold Pattern, The Calendar of Feasts, The Sacred Diagram, The Symbolical Numbers, The Name of God, The Kingdom of Darkness) give indications of their contents; but beyond this Dr. FARRER makes no other condescension to his readers. Though it should be added that the text of the Apocalypse given in the last part of the book should enable those who have mastered the exposition to read the Apocalypse with new interest, perhaps even with 'the maximum of pleasure.'

We shall not here attempt to give an account of the Scheme of the Apocalypse, as that unfolds itself to Dr. FARRER as a result of his long and careful studies of its imagery and symbolism. But let us quote in conclusion his view of St. John's origin and affinities as summed up in the last sentences of his book: 'It may be most sensible to see St. John as an Asian Jew, brought up in a rabbinic school, where Hebrew was studied and Aramaic was not dead, but having for his everyday environment a more Hellenized Jewry which did its theology in Greek and was liable to develop gnostical tendencies; and, neither very early nor very late in life, converted to Christ. What he then became was not the effect of his background, but the act of his inspiration: we can see it coming to the birth under our very eyes.'

Poneron and Kakon in Old and New Testaments.

BY THE REVEREND W. F. LOFTHOUSE, D.D., WOODSTOCK, OXFORD.

ALL languages recognize the distinction between good and its opposite bad. And most recognize also a distinction within the opposite of good; bad and evil, *malum* and *turpe*, *kakon* and *poneron*, *rasha'* and *ra'*. In current English the two words are often, though by no means always, used interchangeably. In Hebrew a careful study of the passages in which the words occur points to a definite distinction in their use, though one that is not always maintained. The same is true, though with rather less clear demarcation, of the corresponding pair in the Greek Testament. Our English Versions appear to take but little notice of the distinction, a neglect that has its perils for exegesis.

The distinction, however, is clear enough to warrant analysis. Let us therefore, recognizing that space forbids anything approaching a complete catalogue of the relevant passages, turn first to the Old Testament, and ask what objects are called *ra'* and what *rasha'*, noting where the two may be interchangeable. We begin with *ra'*, generally but by no means always rendered 'evil.' It is used, first, of inanimate or impersonal things, in the obvious sense of harmful—poisonous herbs, diseases, arrows; wild beasts, tainted waters, rotten figs, barren cows. Second, of hard times (as in Am 5^{13}), defamatory reports, harsh treatment, quarrelsomeness or rage, like the so-called evil spirit between Abimelech and the Shechemites or in the breast of Saul towards David (Jg 9^{23}, 1 S $18^{9f.}$). Third, the evil disposition or eye; evil minds or actions or words, as when one renders evil for evil (Gn 50^{15}). Fourth, of what is actually

bad—evil, as the phrase is, in the sight of the Lord (1 K 16^{30}). It is not easy to keep the four classes apart, especially the two last. In Jeremiah, who used the word *ra'* more frequently than any other Old Testament writer, *ra'* is coupled with war and pestilence; it is the calamity that is brought from the North. God watches over His people for evil, or He may repent him of the evil He had caused. The fault of the Jews lies in the stubbornness of their evil heart (11^{8} 16^{12}). The Lord's people do evil to Him, and He repays them with evil, though He may think thoughts to them not of evil but of peace. Later, to fear God is to eschew or depart from evil (Job 1^{8}, Pr 3^{7}). The Psalmist's enemies speak evil of him, but he knows that while he hates evil he need not fear it (Pss 41^{6} 97^{10} 121^{7} 23^{6}).

The general meaning is clear. *Ra'* is something that is mischievous, harmful, disastrous, that has to be got rid of by prevention or cure or destruction. It is wrought to man by God, as it is wrought to God by man.

We may here consider the regular opposite of evil, namely, good. In the Hebrew the meanings of good range from the useful, the harmless, the pleasant, to what is excellent of its kind, especially in conduct to God and to man, and more particularly of God's attitude to man. In the latter regard, like *agathos* in the New Testament, it often approaches kindliness and good will. 'Truly, God is good to Israel.' Hence the constant opposition of good to evil; to requite evil for good, or good for evil. The Psalmist who fears no evil knows that good will pursue him all his life. To Amos, as to Job, God is the source of good and evil alike. In the same way an infant is unable to distinguish good from evil (Is 7^{16}); he has the same difficulty in distinguishing his right hand from his left (Jon 4^{11}). He has yet to learn that fire burns him and that it is good for him to bear the yoke in his youth. Although they lived in a world where all God's creation was good, such distinction was beyond the power of the newly created Adam and Eve, until they tasted the forbidden tree, thus making themselves as gods, knowing the secret of their bliss and their bane. The difference between obedience and disobedience they already knew.

A word should perhaps be added here as to the *Yezer ha ra'*, the evil imagination of Gn 6^{5} 8^{21}; in the Jeremiah passages quoted above the word translated 'imagination' is different. The word appears in two passages in Sir 15^{14} $27^{5f.}$ and possibly in a third, 21^{11}; and the conception is developed at length in the Rabbinic writings. As a mould or pattern, it is placed in man by God; the very word *yezer* suggests the potter. It is a disposition, so the Rabbis interpret it, to prefer harmful acts; it would seem to be supplied to each individual separately; and it can be overcome, or made the instrument of good. It is not regarded as a rooted spirit of defiance to God; it is *ra'* and not *rasha'*. N. P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*, suggests a comparison with Jung's description of the *libido*.

We may also reflect on what may be called the 'timing' of evil. What is felt to be evil at one time may be thought of as a positive source of blessing at another. What is shunned and dreaded to-day may be welcomed or schemed for to-morrow. This is not an aspect of *ra'* which is emphasized in the Old Testament though it finds expression in Ps 119^{71}, and on a nobler scale in Is 53. But there is nothing which can be called *ra', an sich*; when we speak of a thing as evil we are really thinking not of the object but of our own changing or transitory feelings to it. To talk about God as 'creating' evil is really unmeaning; all we can say is that He has given living beings the capacity of suffering pain and distress, now from this object or experience, now from that. On the other hand, as we cannot but be aware, wickedness is always wickedness; it remains what it is; we can never come to terms with it.

When we turn to the Old Testament uses of *rasha'* the emphasis is on the relation to God rather than on the consequences to man. Man may indeed act as *rasha'* to man, like the quarrelling Hebrews in Egypt, or murderers like the two sons of Rimmon; but wicked riches are the result of fraudulence which the Lord hates. True, there are a number of subjects to which both the terms 'evil' and 'wicked' can be applied; words, acts, persons, disobedience to a Divine command. But the emphasis is different. A wicked ruler over a poor people is like a roaring lion (Pr 28^{15}). The wicked are those who are guilty of hostility to God, like Korah and Dathan, Pharaoh and Babylon. *Rasha'* is a word, however, that is comparatively rare before the Exile, but common enough in Ezekiel, Psalms, and the Wisdom literature. Its opposite, righteous, *çaddiq*, unlike good, but like wicked, is never applied to the inanimate or impersonal; it is used solely of God and man, and of their acts and words to one another. It always moves in the sphere of personal relations. Consequently (and this deserves more emphasis than it generally finds, specially for its bearing on the language of the New Testament and the word *dikaios*) it does not stand for morality, but for the right attitude between persons. God is righteous, not because He is truthful or chaste or honest, but because His attitude to men is always right, whether in condemnation or deliverance; in 2 Isaiah, the great song of deliverance, righteousness and salvation flow together. That is the

righteousness which, in the New Testament, is brought to light in the Atonement (Ro 3^{21}). So, also, man is unrighteous, not because he is guilty of a particular sin, but because he is hostile to man or to God, with all that such hostility implies.

Let us now turn to the correlatives in the New Testament—*poneron* and *kakon*; the first generally translated 'evil,' and the second 'wicked.' It may be interesting to notice that *poneron* occurs seventy-five times, and *kakon* forty-five times in the New Testament, *poneria* seven times, and *kakia* eleven times. In the R.V. 'evil' is used to render *kakos* or *kakon* thirty-five times and *poneros* forty-five times; and 'wicked' translates *kakos* once and *poneros* (in all cases but one referring to human beings) sixteen times. 'Bad,' as it happens, only occurs three times in the New Testament—once for *kakos*, once for *poneros*, and once for *sapros*. For the original meaning of *kakos* no help is to be found from etymology; it seems in early Greek writers to connote social or financial rather than purely moral undesirability. 'The poor in a loomp is bad. . . .' *Kakopoiein* in the papyri means to damage, like mice; *kakopoios* in 1 P 4^{15} may mean sorcerer; and *kakōs echein* means to get into trouble or to be, as we say, in a bad way. *Poneros* is clearly derived from *ponos*, toil or mischief or drudgery; anything, it would appear, that is unpleasant; though Hesiod calls Herakles *ponerotatos kai aristos*, 'most overworked and magnificent of men.' If we might interpret the word with this etymology we might all claim to be *poneroi*. So closely were these opposites juxtaposed that some have supposed their distinction to be a mere matter of accent; *póneron*, toilsome, and *ponerón*, bad.

If we now examine the instances of *poneron* in the New Testament we shall find it, like *ra'* in the Old Testament, applied to both things and human beings. We may distinguish three classes. It is used, for example, (*a*) of calumnious words, rotten fruit, contentious thoughts, impure objects that defile the body, acts in general that are a nuisance to man and to God; evil eyes, evil days, suspicions; it is applied to the heart and the conscience; dangerous thoughts, perhaps, as the Japanese might say; to a groundless boast, a torturing wound; and to unclean spirits. (*b*) It is also used of parents with their children (Mt 7^{11}); a sinful generation (Mt 12^{39}), an unprofitable slave (Mt 25^{26}), and, in general, ill-natured human beings. Mark uses the word only twice. *Poneria* is used as a parallel to theft, lewdness, injustice; we read of powers or hosts of spiritual *poneria* in heavenly places (R.V. translates 'wickedness'). (*c*) When the adjective is used substantivally with the definite article there are only three instances where it specifically means the evil *one* (two of them in 1 John), and only one where it clearly means the evil thing; in all other instances the case used is either genitive or dative, and the gender is therefore uncertain; for example, what is more than these cometh of the evil; the tares are the produce of the evil; so, too, the darts of the evil; the whole world lies in the evil. But the use by our Lord of *ho diabolos* points to the masculine rather than the neuter; it seems natural to explain the *diabolos* as the *poneros*, and vice versa. The actual instances are very carefully considered in N. P. Williams, *op. cit.*, 110 ff.

When we turn to the use of *kakos* in the New Testament we find once more both the personal and the impersonal, though never *ho kakos* to correspond to *ho poneros*. The word indeed is rare in the Synoptics; it does not occur in the Fourth Gospel. What *kakon* hath he done? From within come *kaka*. Never do *kakon* that good may come. Money is the root of *kaka*. Several times we read in Acts of the *kaka* wrought by the persecuting Saul of Tarsus. In the Pastorals Paul speaks of the *kaka* done to him by Alexander, and quotes the condemnation of the Cretans as *kaka theria*, vicious animals; but, in general, in the Pauline Epistles the distinction between the two terms is maintained scrupulously (Ro 2^{9}, 1 Co 13^{5}, Eph 5^{16}, 1 Th 5^{22}). Only twice, both times in the Gospels, is the word explicitly used of persons; once of the wasteful slave (parallel to *poneros*), once of the fraudulent vine-keepers. It is worth noting that in the Epistle of James (1^{13}) God is said to be not tempted *kakōn*, of wicked things, or, perhaps, individuals; the context suggests sin rather than harmfulness; the tongue is a restless *kakon*, worse than an animal; a thing of wickedness (3^{8}); and in Revelation the Ephesian Church cannot bear the load of wicked men (*kakōn*). The unclean spirits are *ponera*, never *kaka*; nor do we ever find *poneros* and *kakos* linked together as synonyms or parallels.

Kakon, then, is habitually predicated of actions, which imply not the thing but the person; *kakon* always carries with it the idea of moral obliquity. *Poneron* does not. If we reflect on our own judgments we shall be aware that the attitude 'this is a nuisance, it must be got rid of' overlaps not seldom with 'this is wicked and must be punished.' All of us tend to condemn the injurer as well as to dislike the injury. Solemn Courts have sat in judgment on the bull that has gored a man, and on the homicidal axe. But in a world where we are constantly colliding with things and men alike, the first necessity for rational conduct and social order is to distinguish between *poneron* and *kakon*, and to recognize that a man, who will often be either the one or the other, is not necessarily both.

Thus a slave may be both troublesome and wasteful and also wicked (Mt 25^{26} 24^{48}). He could have been the first without being the second. Parents may do harm to their children, as to others; but they do not wilfully give them stones for bread. Society as a whole may be *poneron*, like the human eye—the 'evil eye' is dreaded over the whole of the East to-day—or the heart; it must be changed or rendered harmless. So with the evil spirits. They may have to be rated soundly, like the winds and the billows; they are *akatharta*, unclean, like an infected object; they are not *kaka*, wicked. In the same way, mischievous persons must not be interfered with; 'resist not him that is *poneros*, troublesome, or harmful; let him have his way with you.' How seldom the pacifists or the rest of us dare to obey this injunction; harder indeed to carry out than the similar but distinct prohibition against countering one *kakon*, one wicked action, by another (Ro 12^{21}), and meeting malice with malice (1 Th 5^{15}).

What then of *ho poneros*? I assume that the gender is masculine; that we are bidden to pray for deliverance from him. Cain was of him; the whole of society lies in him. If we might take the expression as neuter, there would be little difficulty. We are all aware of the contrariety, the 'cussedness,' of Nature. Nature itself groans and travails; it is the constant source of pain, agony, horror, frustration, death; the restless incitement to passion, rage, lust, and unmentionable crimes. But our Lord appears to contemplate more than this; a prince of this world, who comes, He says, 'and has nothing in me,' any more than the man who is in God can be touched by the evil one. The devil is in fact always trying to set us at odds with the world and with God (cf. Eph 6^{16}, 1 P 5^{8}). We may regard this as a piece of mythology, a mere personification of the brute forces around us; or we may conclude that there is something abroad in the world which actually purposes mischief on the largest scale. The important thing is to recognize that we live in a world of *poneria*, from which we must be rescued, or rescue ourselves; a world for which moral distinctions do not exist, any more than they existed for the tower of Siloam or for Pilate with his Galileans; and that this *poneria* may rouse the *kakia*, the positive wickedness in our hearts, which can only be dealt with by destruction or forgiveness.

We cannot but notice that the distinction is not maintained so carefully in the New Testament as in the Old Testament. Lazarus, for instance, in contrast to Dives' luxury, has to suffer *kaka*. The Philippian jailor is besought to do himself no *kakon*. The Melitans expected to see Paul suffer some *kakon* from the viper. The plague in Rev 16^{2} is both *poneron* and *kakon*. In 1 Peter *ra'* is twice translated by *kakon*; but there the author is loyal to the LXX.

The Old Testament distinction between *ra'* and *rasha'* is the clearer when we remember that the opposite of *rasha'* is *çaddiq*, righteous (cf. Gn 18^{23}), not *tobh*. That would suggest that, if we could rely on the parallel, the opposite of *kakos* would be *dikaios*. In some few instances, indeed, *kakos*, like *poneros* constantly, is opposed to *agathos* (Lk 16^{25} above and Ro 3^{8}; cf. Ro 5^{7}); but the regular opposite of *dikaios* is *adikos* or *asebes*. In the Synoptists the *dikaios* is respectable and scrupulously loyal to the social and religious standards of the day; but Jesus professed in him little interest (Mt 9^{13}). In the Pauline Epistles divine righteousness results in the attitude of the man who has learnt the meaning of faith; it is established neither by the performance of moral acts nor the avoidance of immoral ones, but by a personal and filial relation to God. This is a meaning which is at best only hinted at for *çaddiq* in the Old Testament; nor can *rasha'* be said to connote its opposite. In the New Testament neither *kakos* nor any other single word expresses the opposite of the *dikaios*, who comes into life by his faith. In the New Testament we must look for its expression in the doctrine of an alienated world, *rasha'* rather than *ra'*; yet the triumph of the *poneros*, that baleful and mischievous power in whose grip the world lies, would be to cut man off from God permanently and leave him in a state whose consequences would be beyond the power of language to describe. Nothing can be more tragic than to be at enmity with God.

We thus come back to the distinction already familiar to us—familiar indeed to thoughtful people from the days of Plato's *Republic*—between the consequences of an act or attitude, and the true character of the act or attitude itself. But what stands out in the language of the Old Testament, surprisingly uniform from the earliest books to the latest, is the difference between the mischievous agent and the reprobate character. The former may be an inanimate object, a human being, or God, though the term *ra'* is naturally never applied to God. The impulse to this misery or mischief may be the harmfulness inherent in Nature (though Gn 3 would seem to be a protest against such a view); or the resentment or malice of man; or the determination of God, through or independently of those other agencies, to give effect to the maxim *drasanti pathein*.

The contrast here suggested between *poneron* and *kakon* is less clear; but there are very few passages even in the New Testament where it will not be found to be, at the least, exegetically suggestive. Though often overlooked by Christian theology and Christian preaching, it is essential to

all the New Testament teaching of the Fatherhood of God—the teaching that, whatever the consequences of alienation may be, the alienation itself is the disaster; and that to free us from such a disaster the Father sent His Son down, for us, to the gates of death. It is the business of the King to protect his people from suffering; of the Judge to inflict suffering on the wrongdoers. It is the joy of the Father to restore the prodigal and the rebellious, whether by the appeal of Lk 15 or Is 53 or both, into the harmony and peace of the heavenly family.

Literature.

THE PSALMS.

All recent study of the Psalms begins with a recognition of their origin in the cultus. The cult practices of ancient Israel may often have been crude, and much in them was derived from the Canaanites and other peoples. Yet the astonishing thing is that the Psalms, speaking generally, are entirely appropriate for the public and private worship of Christians. This is brought out very clearly by Dr. Elmer A. Leslie in *The Psalms: Translated and Interpreted in the Light of Hebrew Life and Worship* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $5.00).

The aim of the book is 'to make the reading of the Psalms an intelligible, interesting, and inspiring experience. Its appeal is to ministers, thoughtful laymen, and students, who know that the Psalter contains untold spiritual wealth, yet feel themselves to be in possession of but a small part of it. Its intent is to bring to the average reader of the Bible, in non-technical terms, the sifted results of the most reliable scholarly study of these lyric expressions of Hebrew life and worship.' In this aim the author has succeeded.

Dr. Leslie fully acknowledges his debt to Gunkel, Mowinckel, and Hans Schmidt; indeed, he may be said to have distilled the essence of their studies for the benefit of non-specialist American and English readers. The translations of the Psalms are his own, based on the third edition of Kittel's 'Biblia Hebraica' with a generous appropriation of the textual emendations which it recommends. Generally, a few verses of translation are offered at a time, together with a kind of running commentary. The order in which the several Psalms are treated is not that of the Bible. Instead, they are divided into related groups, very much on the lines of Gunkel's 'types.' Each Psalm is given an appropriate title, and an index shows at a glance where any particular Psalm is to be found. Occasionally a translation is not very felicitous, as, for example, 'Thou didst give him as food, as grub [reading *la'am*, sic! for Gunkel's *la'as*] for jackals' (Ps 74^{14}); but perhaps this is intentional. Comments are sometimes fulsome, or border upon the 'precious': was there ever swallow that flew 'with a worm for her young in her bill'? (on Ps 84^{3}).

Dr. Leslie's purpose being what it is, it is a pity he has not made use of the most recent work of Scandinavian scholars, of Bentzen of Copenhagen and the Uppsala School, who have continued along the lines of Gunkel and Mowinckel, particularly with reference to the sacral kingship in ancient Israel, an element in the cultus which Dr. Leslie fully appreciates. He might then, also, have been less ready to adopt so many of Gunkel's 'tentative' textual emendations, which, for all their brilliance, are sometimes pure guesswork. For example, his translation of Ps 110 is from Gunkel's reconstructed text; but Widengren, in a short monograph on the Psalm, has, without altering a single consonant of the Massoretic Text, given a translation which places the sacral kingship in what seems to the present reviewer a very attractive light. This may be asking much of an author, but it is only what anyone who writes on the Psalms in future will have to be prepared to do.

C. R. North.

THE CONFLICT OF GOOD AND EVIL.

Dr. Edwin Lewis, of the Chair of Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion at Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey, has written extensively in the Biblical and theological fields, and now comes another major work from his pen—*The Creator and the Adversary* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $3.00). It is a contribution to the study of the problem of evil. But not so much from the philosophical as from the theological standpoint, and more specifically from the standpoint of the Christian revelation. But the author is not content with the traditional Christian approach to the problem (Augustinian and Calvinistic) in which the goodness of Almighty God is limited by man's abuse of free will. In his opinion a more reasonable approach is made when the Christian theologian summons also to his aid

the old conception of the Adversary which has a place in both Old Testament and New Testament religion.

Little is said here, however, as to the nature of the Adversary. The author is content to set the Creator and the Adversary over against each other, and to describe the world-process as creativity in strife with discreativity, creativity being the action of the Creator from the beginning and discreativity that of the Adversary from the beginning, even before man was. Not that the Creator and the Adversary form an ultimate dualism, but God cannot act creatively without making it possible for the Adversary to act discreatively. Creation carries with it a *plus*, and that *plus* is what evil is. Complete Divine quiescence would mean that there is no evil, nothing demonic, nothing absolutely irrational and immoral, save as 'dark metaphysical necessity.'

Dr. E. S. Brightman spoke of 'dark metaphysical necessity' as 'The Given,' and ascribed it to the Divine nature (but not to the Divine reason and will); Dr. Lewis, more jealous for the purity of his theism, and less concerned for the sacrosanctity of metaphysical monism, thinks of 'The Given' as over against the Divine nature and not as included in it.

Here is how Dr. Lewis expresses his theistic and Christian attitude to the problem of evil: 'The basic evil is in the fact that if there is to be created good, there will also be discreative evil as the enemy of the good, and if evil is even then to serve the cause of good, it will be only as creativity is willing to pay the price of subjecting it. Christianity very simply affirms that creativity pays this price precisely in the means it adopts to become redemptive as well.' He adds, giving a cosmic and even metaphysical meaning to the Cross, 'The fitting symbol of creativity in conflict with discreativity, of the Divine in conflict with the demonic, more concretely of the Creator in conflict with the Adversary, is a Cross and a Crown of Thorns, and not otherwise can there be that Resurrection which is the Creator's final triumph.'

We shall not discuss this theory of a conflict between good and evil at the heart of things in a theistic world. It has roots not only in Scripture but also in the history of thought. But we must hasten not to leave the impression that this book is mainly composed of a severely speculative treatment of the problem of evil. Its main purpose is to affirm in face of the world's evil that the God of creation and providence is the loving God revealed in Jesus Christ. More precisely, it is to affirm an evangelical interpretation of Christianity in terms of conflict. This affirmation it makes somewhat discursively, but often in graphic terms; and if the illustrative instances so frequently cited from Tennyson, Browning, Matthew Arnold, and others among the older poets and writers are usually by no means unfamiliar, they may serve to throw light upon some more or less general and abstract discussions.

W. Fulton.

ST. PAUL'S GOSPEL TO THE ROMANS.

Archbishop Temple once confessed that while with St. John he had always felt at home the Pauline Epistles seemed a strange and adventurous country. Not so, it is evident, with the Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith, for whom *the* classic of the Faith is the Epistle to the Romans. His latest book, *St. Paul's Gospel to the Romans* (Blackwell; 10s. 6d. net), is a stimulating study of the Epistle, having for one of its chief features, as the title itself indicates, the insistence that Christianity is originally and authentically not an ethical ideal nor the remembrance of an inspired Teacher, but the proclamation of the Divine redemption of the world in Jesus Christ, and that its essence is most clearly set forth not in the Synoptic Gospels, but in the Acts and the Epistles and supremely in this great Epistle which is the most mature and systematic statement of the faith by the keenest thinker and most vigorous personality of the Apostolic Church.

The central portion of this book consists of a running paraphrase of the Epistle giving the general sense and inserting useful clues to the transitions of the argument, followed by eight chapters in which the dominant themes are expounded and related both to ancient thought and to modern conditions. Here we have in short compass, lucidly and forcibly set out, a comprehensive course in Christian doctrine from which anyone whose theology has grown rusty could not fail to profit.

Amongst this wealth of material special attention may be called to the brief but freshly conceived account of Paul's career, and to the short glossary of Pauline technical terms, such as 'blood,' 'justification,' 'righteousness,' and 'wrath,' misunderstanding of which has sometimes had unfortunate consequences both in theology and in church history. Interesting also is the section upon Paul's use of the Old Testament. There is often more to his quotations than immediately appears.

The peak-passage from which the whole scheme of Paul's thought may be surveyed is found in $8^{18ff.}$; the message of Creation-wide redemption, and it is argued that to this fundamental doctrine the other conceptions, such as Election, Justification, and Glory, ought to be related. It might

be felt that this is to hang too much upon a somewhat slender peg (but see p. 194). At all events Paul does conceive of redemption on a cosmic scale. The attention of the Bible is not confined to the individual soul. We are taught to think bigly of God and His action in Christ.

Another important section is that on Christian Unity, where it is argued that although uniformity might be agreeable, Christ is more honoured by the maintenance of faith and love amid conscientious differences than by authoritarian uniformity or sectarian exclusiveness.

Not the least interesting part of the book is the Questionnaire, where the essential agreement of Paul with the Synoptic teaching is repeatedly and convincingly illustrated.

There are misprints on pp. 36, 108, 118, 119.

A. D. ALEXANDER.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.

Professor A. M. Hunter, of Aberdeen, is to be congratulated on his courage and craftsmanship in attempting to write a commentary on the English text of *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, under such severe restrictions of space (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). In these circumstances Professor Hunter can do no more than write thoughtful and suggestive introductions to the several narratives and short notes on various points of exegetical importance. We regret the opening sentence in the Preface: 'The day of the aridly critical commentary is past.' Any one who cares for truth must watch with misgivings the growing demand for 'theological' commentaries, with the assumption that the study of the meaning of words and of textual, critical, and historical problems is a matter of secondary importance, so that in the words of the Editors, we can 'concentrate the mind on the essential Gospel contained in the various books of the Bible.'

The commentary itself is full of wise and discerning remarks, especially when the section on the Passion Narrative is reached. Thus, it is pointed out that the unnamed woman who anointed the head of Jesus 'had penetrated into the secret of the Suffering and Dying Messiah.' The acts of Jesus at the Last Supper are described as 'effecting in symbol that sacrifice he was soon to accomplish in fact.' The cup of affliction (10^{38} and 14^{36}) is 'the cup our sins had mingled.' The words concerning the coming of the Son of Man in 14^{62} 'predict not a descent, but an ascent'; so far from being a prophecy of the Second Coming, they are a prediction that Jesus will be exalted to the presence of God. The mockery of 14^{65} is 'a grim game of Blind Man's Buff.' General Booth is effectively quoted in connexion with the Crucifixion scene: 'The Jews would have believed in him if he had come down from the cross. We believe in him because he stayed up.' These comments, crisp, suggestive, provocative, opening vistas and stimulating reflection, show us how much we have lost through severe limitations of space, and awake the hope of much more to come. It is, of course, the supreme tribute to any work that, when we have read it, like Oliver Twist, we ask for more.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

CHRISTIAN THEORY AND PRACTICE.

The publishers' note on Mr. Guy Kendall's *The Social Application of Christianity* (Duckworth; 5s. net) suggests that this scholarly little book is to contain an answer to the question, What exactly is the teaching of the New Testament and the Early Church on the problems of society? What the book actually does is to show how varied and inconclusive it is. He jolts the mind out of complacency and unthinking acceptance of common assumptions, and leaves it with the disconcerting impression that about the social application of Christianity a study of the facts reveals contradiction, uncertainty, inconsistency, and hesitation, as bewildering to-day as ever. His criticism of Troeltsch is that he is too copious on the theories held at different periods and too little interested in the practice.

Mr. Kendall first lays down a line of defence against any possible charges of irreverence in dealing with the Church and Christian teaching by questioning the reliability in detail of the extant reports of Jesus' words, and by exposing the crudity of the notion that it can be proved that Jesus laid the foundation of a hierarchical system or looked to a visible society with a fixed constitution.

He then proceeds to note the divergent views of the State found in the Epistles and in the Apocalypse; that the Church never possessed a unitary organization (by the time the authority of the Curia and the Pope was established in the West the Eastern Church had separated), and that the Church was for centuries a slave-holding institution (a Council in the seventh century threatens a bishop, a mere life-renter, if he should liberate a slave, the inalienable property of the Church, without giving the compensation due). He remarks on early praise of a Communism like that described in Acts, unaccompanied by any objection to the accession of wealthy members. He notes the justification of slavery by Augustine, Bonaventura, and Aquinas, and by American churches eighty years ago. From the earliest times to the present the attitude to war and

military service has been ambiguous. In economics the idea of a 'just price' was fashionable in the Middle Ages, and after being dropped in *laissez-faire* times now shows signs of revival. The Christian emphasis on the family does not echo Jesus' insistence that loyalty to a wider group is more imperative. As regards modern Communism there is every view, ranging from utter abhorrence to the Red Dean's assertion that Soviets have been casting out devils, though not in Christ's name, and 'he that is not against us is for us.'

Noteworthy is Mr. Kendall's view that anxious consideration of the letter of Jesus' sayings on divorce may be rather pointless if they are taken as unguarded aphorisms like those on oaths and on turning the other cheek, and interpreted just as vigorous assertions of the sanctity of marriage.

So what? Mr. Kendall has nothing to say further, but just brings his book to an abrupt close with what seems a defiant *non sequiter*, the quotation of the apostolic words, 'Love never faileth.'

This sober survey of factual history suggests doubt about the bland assumption in Mr. W. G. Peck's *An Outline of Christian Sociology* (James Clarke; 8s. 6d. net) that an adequate critique of social and economic practice can be established on a theological basis. Mr. Peck refers to 'Christian Sociologists' as if they were a recognized corporation of experts like actuaries or dentists, whereas the words are no more than a label for theologians who have expressed views on social and economic questions. This book contains able and interesting pronouncements on such matters as Douglas Credit, Soil Conservation, Nationalization, and International Exchange, but it is highly doubtful whether the theological standpoint gives them special weight.

R. W. Stewart.

The Dr. Williams's Trust Lecture delivered in October last at the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen, by the Rev. Ernest A. Payne, Senior Tutor, Regent's Park College, Oxford, is published —*The Anabaptists of the Sixteenth Century and Their Influence in the Modern World* (Carey Kingsgate Press; 1s. net). In a very scholarly fashion the influence of the views of early Anabaptists are traced in English Puritanism, Quakerism, and the radical sects of the Commonwealth. Further they were pioneers in views which many churches now adopt—the claim for toleration and liberty of conscience, the independence of the Church from the State, the 'voluntary' principle, and so on. The Lecture shows that for the Anabaptists persecuted in those early days by Romanists, Lutherans, and Calvinists, we should have some sympathy.

The Baptism and Temptations of Christ (James Clarke; 6s. net) is a study of myth and fact in Holy Scripture. The author, Mr. Frank Buchanan, ranges largely over both Old Testament and New, and the truth he would enforce and illustrate—more especially from the episodes of our Lord's Baptism and Temptation—is that in the Bible the myth triumphs over the fact and not vice versa, as in the experienced world; or more explicitly, the myth is greater than the facts of life and gathers them up into itself, transforming their frustrated character into that of release. For example, the second temptation (to cast Himself down from a pinnacle of the Temple) is summed up in the context of the baptism and the fasting in the Wilderness as the temptation to assert the hope of Israel at the expense of her frustration, to assert the myth against the fact. What these words mean it is not easy to see, apart from a careful examination of their context. Even then, the meaning does not leap to the eye, despite the author's effort and care. And this remark applies to the contents of the book as a whole. One has the feeling that the author overdrives his thesis.

The Two Trees (Collins; 2s. 6d. net), by Father Gerald Vann, O.P., consists of three broadcast talks, one given on Passion Sunday, one on Palm Sunday of 1948, one in the series on, 'Am I my Brother's Keeper?' together with a chapter on the Problem of Pain which was a talk given at the Oxford University Chaplaincy in February 1948. On the dust cover of the book there is the statement, 'Father Vann has been compared with Plato for the poetic quality of his thought, and with Aristotle for his common sense.' The comparison is an exaggeration! It is undoubtedly true that these talks lose something when they are set down in cold print, although doubtless they sounded excellent when given in speech. The two trees are the tree in Eden from which the forbidden fruit was eaten, and the tree of Calvary wherein is the remedy for that sin. The best of the talks is the one from the series, 'Am I my Brother's Keeper?' There, there is finely stressed the practical nature of Christian love. The emotion of pity is never enough; it must be translated into the acts of love. The talk on the problem of pain has nothing new to say but says the old things finely and well and stresses the noble thought that our sufferings, if we take them rightly, have also a redemptive significance. The book breathes an attitude of devotion and will be valuable for the quiet hour.

Professor T. E. Jessop's finely conceived and finely written book on the Christian Ethic has now been published by the Epworth Press (6s. net). It appeared first, with the same title—*Law and Love*—in 1940 when the publishers were the Student Christian Movement Press. It was reviewed in our December issue of that year. We have been born into a composite moral tradition, inherited largely from Greece and Rome. If it were analysed it would be seen to consist of two elements, one is devotion to duty, the subjugation of desire to will, of conduct to law. The other is simply expediency for the fulfilment of social needs. Professor Jessop regards both as unchristian, and the supremely Christian element as love. This is argued with great force and clearness through a series of chapters in which the characteristics of love as a virtue are expounded with simplicity and persuasiveness.

The Personality of Jesus, by the Rev. Wallace Deane (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), is an entirely harmless, pleasantly written volume. Devoid of any sense of the pressure of any particular problem it makes no particular contribution. It is odd, in view of the statement on the jacket that Mr. Deane tries 'to analyse the personality of Jesus from the angle of modern psychology,' to find that his remarks on the Temptation take twenty lines. The book is really a gentle, adoring commentary on the gospel story, filled with such tributes as 'No word of folly or haste fell from His pale lips. This is wonderful in our eyes.'

The Romance of New Testament Scholarship, the Drew Lectures, by Principal Wilbert Francis Howard, M.A., D.D. (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), is a perfectly delightful book. The title was suggested to the author by the President of Drew University, Madison, New Jersey, when he invited Dr. Howard to deliver a course of lectures to the professors and students in the Divinity Faculty. As the terms of the Trust required that the subject should be treated biographically representative groups of scholars were considered so as to show how generation by generation our knowledge of the New Testament has been added to by the researches of the learned. Dr. Howard begins far back in the Ancient Church, but he soon comes into touch with more modern days in 'Two German Scholars' (Baur and Harnack). Then we are engaged with 'The Cambridge Triumvirate' (Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort). A chapter on 'Discoverers of Ancient Manuscripts' follows, dealing with Tischendorf, Rendel Harris, and R. H. Charles. 'The Papyrologists' come next, with Deissmann, Moulton, and Milligan. And the book is rounded off with a special lecture on William Mitchell Ramsay, who certainly deserved a place in such a story. Part of the interest of this book lies in the biographical pictures of the men dealt with. But the discoveries made and the contributions to our knowledge are, of course, very properly the main theme. And learning and life alike contribute to the value and fascination of a rare and welcome volume.

A book of essays by one who is a well-known business man and an ardent Christian promises well. And *A Bow at a Venture*, by Sir Angus Watson (Independent Press; 8s. 6d. net), amply fulfils the expectation. The author was Northern Divisional Food Officer for six years during the War, and, as he was perforce alone and limited by the black-out, he spent many evenings writing down his convictions on matters economic, religious, and literary. These essays are of very great interest and value. Here are some of the subjects: Can Christianity Survive?; Democracy at the Cross Roads; Does God Intervene?; Why I am not a State Socialist; Why I believe in Foreign Missions; Life's Eternal Enigma; Jonah's Sea Dragon; The Strange Fecundity of Charles Wesley; Was Karl Marx Right?; The Spiritual Insolvency of H. G. Wells. There are forty essays, most of them brief but all of them to the point. It is a remarkable book, and would occupy many hours of quiet evenings to the great benefit intellectually and spiritually of the reader.

The Mirror of God (Independent Press; 6s. net), by the Rev. G. W. J. Cameron-Price, tells the story of Jesus (as one mirroring in miniature the mind of God) in a new and fresh way. The account of the story is given in a letter of James and John (or rather, James) to a brother of theirs who had left Capernaum and prospered in Rome. They touch upon the chief incidents of Jesus' life and the main elements of His teaching, adding comments of their own marked by delicate insight. There are no Scripture references to interrupt the freedom and flow of the narration, and the narration itself is in simple and graphic terms. One notes in particular the restraint in the account of the disciples' experience of the resurrection of Jesus, which had taken place five weeks before the letter to the elder brother in Rome.

Reasonable Service (Inter-Varsity Fellowship; 5s. net), by the Rev. G. W. Bromiley, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., is a study in Christian conduct which aims at giving a straightforward account of what the Christian life is, and at the same time showing how Christian living is related to, and springs from, Christian thinking. Any book on conduct, it is rightly maintained, to be useful and adequate,

must go behind actions to aims and standards and motives—the deeper things of ethics. In this book Christian conduct is first considered in relation to aim and standard, these constituting its foundation. Then it is considered practically in relation to self, neighbour, community, and, above all, God. The whole discussion is on wise and helpful lines, and the author does well in our opinion to seek to lay down the principles of Christian conduct rather than show their application in detail. To do the latter would mean a much larger book and involve him in many minor points of controversy. The discussion on the Sabbath supplies an instance in point. We remark incidentally that the discussion is on broader lines than those usually maintained by writers of the conservative evangelical school.

Holy Communion in the Church of England (Lutterworth Press; 8s. 6d. net), by Mr. R. R. Osborn, is a tribute to the excellence of Cranmer's liturgical work in the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 and appears, appropriately enough, at a time when the Church of England is keeping the Fourth Centenary of its Prayer Books. At such a time Cranmer's contribution comes inevitably under critical review, especially as so authoritative a recent writer as Gregory Dix finds it almost impossible to distinguish Cranmer's eucharistic theology from Zwinglianism. In repudiating this opinion Mr. Osborn seeks to define in what sense Cranmer affirms 'the True Presence' of Christ in the Holy Communion.

Two-thirds of the book is a reminder of Cranmer's achievement, as giving an account of his eucharistic and liturgical workmanship in the 'turning of the Mass into the Communion.' The account is, of course, consistent with the author's appreciation of Cranmer's ideals of eucharistic worship. In the succeeding portion of the book it is held that the main outline of the 1552 liturgy should be left undisturbed, and an alternative is suggested to the policy of major revision. In an appendix there is a useful tabulation in parallel columns of the Eucharistic Orders of 1549 and 1552.

To mark the Fourth Centenary of the First English Prayer Book Messrs. Mowbray have issued a popular account of the history of the Book of Common Prayer—*The Story of the Prayer Book* (3s. 6d. net). The first eight chapters, carrying the story in rapid survey to the end of the nineteenth century, are from the pen of the late Canon Verney Johnstone; the remaining three chapters from that of Canon Ernest Evans. Both names are a guarantee of the scholarly quality of the little volume. Dr. Evans deals principally with the struggle for revision, 1904–1928, and with the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion as a whole. It is a marvel to Canon Verney Johnstone that such a devotional treasure as the Anglican Communion possesses in its varieties of the Book of Common Prayer ever evolved out of such 'singular and sinister state-craft' as Cranmer and his fellow bishops encountered in the course of the new liturgical movement. And in Dr. Evans' opinion 'The Scottish Book of Common Prayer,' issued by the Scots Episcopal Church in 1929, is a model of what a revised book should look like. 'It is a homogeneous whole, the new matter being skilfully interwoven with the old.' 'There is none of that duplication of offices, due to the necessity of allowing the retention of the old by such as so desire, which makes the English Book of 1927 tiresome to handle.'

Teachers looking for a wise and helpful book on the Bible may be pointed to *The Bible Lesson Handbooks, Senior Grade, Second Year* (Religious Education Press; 6s. net). The editor is Miss Bertha C. Krall, and there are forty-four lessons arranged in four sections and covering a large part of the Bible as well as the early history of the Christian Church. The book is drawn up in the light of the latest methods of teaching and it will be a real aid to teachers of Bible Classes and Senior Sunday School scholars.

The Religious Education Press has produced few books better than *Myself and My Creed* (5s. net). It contains notes on the main articles of the Apostles' Creed by different hands. It is not a series of discussions on doctrine. It is a book of *teaching*, and the modern methods of teaching are used in the process. There are 'background' notes which the teacher should absorb but not necessarily mention. There are forms of what is called 'expression work,' practical class work. And each article of the Creed is broken up in an acute and practical analysis, and is illustrated constantly by light from many sources. For example, 'I believe in Jesus Christ' has six lessons, and each lesson is kept close to Scripture by the reference to relevant passages. The book has been the result of a great deal of genuine and intelligent labour and also of co-operation between competent people. As an example of teaching doctrine in the right way it is of immense value.

All that many people know about Marcion is that he completely rejected the Old Testament and much of the New from his Canon of Scripture. That is true; but Marcion was important for more than that, and exercised a strong influence

on the Early Catholic Church, not only by evoking opposition but by setting the pattern. That his own times realized his importance is proved by the many books that were written against him and by the fact that Tertullian wrote his largest work to controvert Marcion.

Till Harnack's work Marcion had received scant notice. Harnack performed a great service in exhibiting the real significance of Marcion's activity. Harnack, however, did not say the last word about Marcion. That is quite clear from the volume now before us—*Marcion and His Influence* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), by Mr. E. C. Blackman, B.D., Tutor in Cheshunt College, Cambridge. It is a very scholarly bit of work; competently done. It covers Marcion's work as Church organizer, as textual critic, as Biblical critic, and as a thinker whose dualism and peculiar Christology made him a heretic. It discusses Marcion's possible influence on the text of the Latin and Syriac versions. The author acknowledges fully the value of Harnack's notable monograph on Marcion, but shows that Harnack was inclined to magnify his hero overmuch. Mr. Blackman enables us to eliminate such exaggeration and gain a fairer view of a very remarkable man.

Another important book on religious education comes from the S.P.C.K.—*No New Thing*, by Mr. A. J. Watts, M.A., Dip.Ed., General Inspector of Education, Oxford. It is described as 'A Handbook of Religious Education with Suggestions for Visual Aids and Activities' (11s. 6d. net). The title, 'No New Thing,' suggests rather the modesty of the author than the content, or even the subject, of the book. It is quite true that the principles which the writer lays down have been known earlier, but they are in our time a new discovery and even so are not by any means universally practised. Mr. Watts is a modern in his approach to the whole subject, and the canons he states are both enlightened and practical. The book is divided into two parts, first, 'General Principles' in which Mr. Watts deals with the syllabus and some of the methods the good teacher should employ. In particular, he lays great stress on visual aids like pictures, diagrams, and maps. This is a special feature of the book, and many diagrams are supplied, some of them coloured, for the use of the teacher. The second part of the book is devoted to some 'practical experiments' and is specially commended; for no teacher will long retain his vitality unless he is ever making experiments. It may be added that Mr. Watts' book arose, not out of theory but out of experience. It contains a large amount of instruction which the author gave to teachers and theological students, and it will be equally useful to teachers and clergy who have not had the privilege of personal contact with the writer.

Religion Through Drama, edited by Mr. Michael Sims-Williams, M.A. (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net), is a book particularly relevant to our time for two reasons. One is the widespread interest that exists in the acting of plays. It almost seems as if every business or profession or religious body has a dramatic section, and the newspapers are filled with notices of plays done by this or that amateur company. The other reason is that good teachers are more and more using the dramatic method in religious instruction in schools. Acting an incident is coming to be a usual method of 'expression work.' The 'Religion Through Drama' Movement is not so much given to acting plays. The words are the words of the performers, and the method suggested is not so much play-acting as charades. Nevertheless, the production of such 'charades' requires a good deal of preparation, and hints and instructions are given in this book on such matters as how to choose courses, how to select cast, production, acting, and costumes. The main part of the book is taken up with five courses —on Amos and Hosea, on how we got the Creeds, on Christianity and the Criminal (Elizabeth Fry), and on Science and Religion. For its purpose nothing could be better than this book, and it ought to be widely known and used. It is much better than acting written plays because it helps the performers to enter into the minds and activities of others and to work out what it all means.

A number of books belonging to a series named 'Viewpoints' have already been reviewed here. The list of volumes is going to be a long one, and the latest, which has just appeared, is on a vital subject. It is *Gambling and the Citizen*, by Mr. Geoffrey Martin (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). All aspects of the topic are discussed intelligently. The staggering fact is noted that seven hundred and eighty million pounds are spent annually on this vice. How much easier the economic situation would be if people had more sense and better morals. We know, however, that the habit is widespread and the real problem is how to cure it. It is very little use constructing an argument to prove it to be wrong. The thing cannot be done. Every argument can be met effectively. The one thing that cannot be met is the moral effect on the gambler. It can be proved from experience that this is wholly evil. But of course the most effective cure is a Christian faith. A converted man does not usually gamble. Mr. Martin looks at all sides of the problem in this little book and if his words were widespread such a book would be an immense blessing.

Doctrine of Man.

Individualism and Totalitarianism Fulfil Each Other.

By Father W. A. Cotton, House of the Resurrection, Mirfield, Yorks.

The hardest task of morality is to achieve a true harmonization of the interests and aims of the self with those of the whole community to which it belongs. We speak of religious and Christian morality. God is in the midst of all our human relationships. In doing good, in being fair and kind to one another, we 'do it unto' the Judge Eternal. Doing it consciously 'as unto the Lord,' remembering God and praying to God, we find God. We are drawn into the Temple to worship Him and give Him thanks.

This was the task set by Christ when He required Everyman to *love thy neighbour as thyself*. The only egoism allowed to a Christian is that which is completely fused with altruism. Our religious worship and our faith in God must work through a limitless expansion of this law of neighbourhood. The first preaching of the Christian gospel was inspired by enthusiasm for mankind as a whole—that *all should be fellow-members in one body*—to *make all men see*, and receive, the unsearchable riches of Christ. All are to be incorporated in one great citizenship of worshipping God and of good will towards men.

To such a fulfilment and vindication of the loving purpose of God there is opposed a double-headed dragon of antagonism. *On the one side* the vainglorious wrongheadedness of Individualism repudiates all duty to the whole to which the self belongs, and for the promotion of whose good it ought to give itself unstintedly and unreservedly. For it is through the mediation of the whole that God gives beginning, continuing, and fulfilment to the individual. It is through the splendour of the universe, and the glorious Church of God, that glory lights upon the head of every child of man, to burn up at last his so persistent vanity. On the destiny of all, the destiny of each one depends. As long as Individualism refuses to be ambitious for a permanent goodness and wholeness, supervening on the 'multitude which no man can number,' it will never reach the perfection of its own cherished selfhood. As long as egoism (or Party-ism) excludes altruism and the adoration of God, the frustrating antagonisms of human life cannot be reconciled and overcome.

On the other side there is the wrongheadedness of Totalitarianism (a word which nevertheless must be rescued from evil associations and set forth as the equivalent of General Smuts' *Holism*, which is Whole-ism). The unbalanced monist philosopher would, in the end, quite suppress the individual with his consciousness, his intuition, his judgment, his freedom, his responsibility, and his happiness. He marks down all the precious gains of human personality for liquidation and absorption—by the universe or by The Absolute—instead of for eternal integration in 'The Christ' that is to be. While the godless totalitarian statesman would treat human persons as mere pawns; he would reduce them to the condition of ants in a system merely of this world. He would degrade all the uses of the developed functions of the individual to serve the corporate vauntings of a Juggernaut Empire, whether racial, capitalist, communist, or military.

The truth is that Individualism and Totalitarianism can balance each other, as two people on a tilt, both being necessary for the great art and practice of human life and morality. They do not cancel each other, but rather fulfil each other. 'The community is moral, because it realizes personal morality; personal morality is moral, because and in so far as it realizes the moral whole' (Bradley, *Ethical Studies*, 188). Community and fellowship in human life, with the whole-making of true Totalitarianism; and personal Individualism, with freedom by virtue of the intuition that can choose aright, are both elements in the universal trend towards perfection. In both we are responsible and accountable, in both we are moral; not through our own human initiative, but as we freely respond and conform to the trend and movement of all things under the domination of God.

So each individual shares in the responsibility of the totality, the corporate body, and in its providential duty, as God's instrument, to every other individual. Besides being something for itself, with its own perfection set before it, each distinct selfhood has solicitude for the multiplicity of other selves, in order that each may be perfect, and that all together may contribute to the destined riches and beauty of the whole. In Christian language it is one Total Flock, all the members of which are mutually responsible for the shepherding that each one needs, under the uniting headship of the One Great Shepherd. Thus the national totality, for instance, knowing well its own position within the larger totality of all mankind, will not be divided within itself by the mutual exclusiveness of different castes and classes. And, by the same

token, it will not become a racial domination and incubus, imposed on other peoples whom it holds down in inferiority. It will not be a wicked dictatorship, suppressing individual freedom, individual initiative, individual development and perfection. But it will be a righteous and truly humanitarian government and power of God in the world, reaching into the future and into the invisible; while endeavouring to bring the present visible world of man, and the brotherhood of all the nations, more and more into conformity with true religion and with the true friendliness of the universe.

Again, the individual members will be earnestly desirous that supernatural virtue may be operative not only in themselves but also throughout whatever smaller or larger totality, of the Church, or the nation, or of the whole present generation of mankind, they consciously belong to. Only, they must realize that the totality does not altogether depend on them as individuals. For it has its own trend and law of development, into some mode of being and supernatural perfection which passes their comprehension as yet, although they aspire after it and are ready to sacrifice themselves for it. If they know not what they themselves shall be, or what is the full perfection that lies before each human personality, how can they know what manner of perfection is in store for the universe, or for humanity as a whole; or even for the great national unities that play their part on the stage of history, visibly before our eyes? They must realize and not deny that every totality constituted by God has its point of view, its duty, its corporate judgment, as well as its destiny. It has, too, its own higher levels of existence and of attainable goodness, its own visions of 'far horizons,' its own aspiring considerations of the Supernatural and the Eternal. They must not despair of their Church, their nation, or their race, nor of any chaotic battling confusion and intermingling of 'churches,' nations, and races. Because that is to despair of the power and art of the pure Spirit of God to overrule and guide it all, and to evolve from its 'wild mass of unpromising material' new combinations into higher unities and totalities —more substantial, more beautiful, and more personal.

Some such despair was darkening the momentary outlook of a chaplain in the First Great War of this century, when writing a letter to his mother. His words might be echoed with a still more wistful plaintiveness now, when the Second War is over but the Peace is not yet won. 'I feel more and more,' he wrote, 'that the whole war is unreal. It has nothing whatever to do with God. He did not cause it or wish it. He never created nations, which are merely man-made. I become more and more an individualist. I don't feel that God can be interested in the war or in the nations taking part in it, or in the righteous causes involved, but solely in each of the individuals engaged. He looks at it all from their point of view. How are they going to take it? What will they make of it?' (*Letters of Oswin Creighton*, 209). But that is an impossible view for a balanced and reflecting mind. Religion (and morality) is not just God and the individual personality. There is the friendly sacramental universe in between. And it is co-ordinated in a series of totalities, each with its own measure of inner consistency, each with its own promise of permanence and of continuing life under God's will, reaching into the eternal world. Each of them has received its own appointment from God as mediating His providential holding and moulding of the many distinct personalities of whose multiplicity it is composed.

The most persistent of all moral antagonisms is where the individual revolts from a willingness to live and die for his fellow-men. And such a revolt comes of the undue assertion of the individual's own selfhood. It comes of egoism, of unbalanced individualism. We cannot forget that a great enhancement of the value of the individual, and of his self-fulfilment in spontaneous responsive activity, is one of the best gifts of Christianity to the world. But we are speaking of what is special to our own day and generation in the whole task of morality. For us the moral summons of to-day is clear. It is to capture every form that can rightly be taken by Totalitarianism for the service of Christian morality. Each of the whole series of totalities, large and small, must be honoured. Each must be claimed, or transformed, to be a sacramental vehicle of God's providence. The individual must hear again the call, that was powerfully sounded in the Christian Middle Ages, to believe passionately in the Divine ordering of the totality of mankind. He must throw himself devotedly into the movement and trend which saves for our universe its friendliness. For it is only this large movement that can really prevail upon all lesser groups and national totalities, as well as upon individuals, to recognize one another as all belonging to the great family of God.

Sin is the bad reason why the sceptic can pretend to think that no true totality of men, mediating God's goodness to one another, is possible. But it is a great mistake thus to think that selfishness is basic in human nature. There is no antagonism between an orange and the orange tree, or between the latter and the earth—'this floating ball' to which all the life we know belongs. Man's life is not just 'nasty and brutish.' He is tied by nature, as well as by Christ's great example and

command, to love others as he loves himself. Hobbes was wrong, as Kant after him was wrong, in counting the natural passions of man—which are his natural instincts, impulses, affections and inclinations—as unfit for harnessing and sublimating to the use of moral guidance. This scepticism as to the moral friendliness of Nature is completely unnatural because it allows for no community or totality of life, of corporate judgment, and of tendency to perfectness; because all possibility of transformation and transmutation, of chastening or of change back from perversion to the truth of things, is absent from its conception of human nature—with all remoulding of misshapen personality. The spiritual world and the spiritual quest is taken as being quite unreal and unpractical. Whereas, so far from being thus unnatural, the supernatural is just the supremely natural; for it is the very purpose and out-burgeoning development that explains the whole existence and process of the natural.

Before loving others as he loves himself, consciously, the individual has loved them unconsciously, as belonging integrally and essentially to the whole family, and to some large sovereignty, of human life. The hand, as one member of the body, will at once, and unconsciously, fend off from the body a weapon or missile that would fatally wound the body. It does so because its own life depends upon the body. So the individual human being has come into the world absolutely dependent on the love of another, and others, than himself; and, responding to that condition of dependence, he must learn, in conscious morality, at least something of what is implicit in his nature —to love his family, his nation, his church, to love the totality of all mankind, before and more than himself; because there is more of necessity, more of safety, more of lovableness, and more of life in it.

Selfishness, like all sin, is the perversion of Nature. Bergson believed that primitive religion was awakened in order to overcome it so far as was possible. We prefer to think that religion was present to man's mind before there was any conscious refusal of his will to respond lovingly to the love of others, or any conscious aggression against their peace. Religion was there when self-consciousness and moral consciousness awaked. It awaked with consciousness, as the elicited response to a power and a protection dimly perceived in the background of things. It was religion, and moral intuition rooted in instinct, which started man on the moral course he must now keep to by conscious freedom and moral science. Instinct itself was only gradually displaced—and never altogether—by conscious will. And religion, as it presided over the beginning of the moral course, will preside over it, overcoming all perversions, to the end.

Religion does not disown or condemn 'the principle of self-love,' but rather counts it as being involved with our instinctive acceptance of life, and with our conscious response to the Giver of life. Its perversion is not in self-regard, but in our disregard of others, of our whole community of persons, and of God. Bishop Butler says: 'We are in a peculiar manner, as I may speak, intrusted with ourselves.' There is a self-regard therefore which is a religious duty. But on the other hand he also says: 'Mankind is a community' and 'the sum of morals' is 'that we all stand in a relation to each other, that there is a public end and interest of society which each particular [person] is obliged to promote' (*Sermons*, xi, xii, ix). So we need the assurance which religion, and the *Christian* religion, alone can give, that these two duties *can both be performed* by us. They are not antagonistic to one another. But contrariwise, they support one another in the one whole of life and reality. This, like freedom and immortality, is a main postulate of morality, depending upon our faith in God. Benevolence was the name chosen by Bishop Butler for the sincere individual's actual promotion of the best interests of society. And he has stated categorically that 'there is no peculiar rivalship or competition between self-love and benevolence.' There is no rivalship because *both* by responsively appreciating the life and personality assigned to us *and* by 'cultivating within ourselves the love of our neighbour' we 'improve' ourselves in the love of God. We increase our experience of the riches of life and our realization of its value. As St. Paul, in his life's enthusiasm to make the Gentiles and 'all men' partakers of the 'promise' and in doing 'all things for the gospel's sake,' was also strengthened by the hope 'that I may be a joint-partaker thereof' (Eph 3^{26}).

In our religious life, natural law, moral law, and Divine law are one. They began together with religion. Together they are summed up for Christians in the life and love of Christ, who is at once the supreme fulfilment of Nature's moral evolution, and the supreme revelation of God's will for man. And He has put them together in the injunction, *love thy neighbour as thyself*, as the command of God, as belonging integrally to our duty towards God, and as an outward and visible way and means of ministering to God. That is, and always was, the morality of man. What is contrary to it was always a perversion and a sin. It never happened according to man's natural development. It belongs to a fall of man, and to a rebellion which ought not to have been, that the 'largely individualistic nature' of his mind can

overbalance his reasonable, natural, and dutiful love of the whole of the human species—and also his love of God. It is thus that 'mind appears as a rebel in the universe, whose self-centredness and purposeful striving might, and largely does, make for disharmony and disorder rather than for peace, order, and harmony. Thus the great ethical problem arises' (Smuts, *Holism*, 237). And men were found 'living in malice and envy, hateful, hating one another' (Tit 3^3).

How shall this one-sided and blameworthy assertion of individual selfhood be overcome? How shall the self be drawn away from its bitter or cynical rivalship with the brotherhood it belongs to, and be effectively persuaded to a heartily responsive service? How shall it be brought into a living co-operation with all other individual persons, on behalf of the whole society in which, under God, it lives and moves and has its being? And how shall it continue to function healthily, happily, and securely, in the growing experience of an endless life?

The answer is that it can do so by remembering God, by obedience to God, by worshipping God. Conscience exists as a sensitiveness to God's judgment, and as a guiding principle in life, for this very purpose. And the enabling environment is there, our whole human society with a corporate judgment and expectation of its own, to support and stimulate the individual moral consciousness. It provides a vast background of urgency and elicitation for all our impulsive activity, and also for all the self-restraint and self-sacrifice that is required of us. Thus the individual personality will look towards the perfection of the whole it belongs to, and towards the multiplicity of values and perfections, of so many others than itself, which exist already in the purpose and thought of God for man. 'Earnest men will always find that to gain their life they must lose it; that not in self but in the whole (including the self) lies the upward road to the sunlit summits' (Smuts, *Holism*, 312 f.). The road is to be traversed in communion with God. And it leads to God.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Thy Servant.

By the Reverend Ronald W. Thomson, Burton-on-Trent.

'O Lord, truly I am thy servant.'—Ps 116^{16}.

At the Birmingham section of the British Industries Fair there was a mechanical maid on show. The maid is a white cabinet about the size of a kitchen stool. Inside it are various gadgets which, when set working, will clean knives, forks, and spoons for you, polish your shoes, whisk eggs, mince meat, grind coffee, peel potatoes, slice bread, dry your hair, drill holes, spray paint, sharpen knives, and wring clothes. This maid can be wheeled from room to room, and placed just where you need her services. How would you like one in your home? I am afraid she costs a lot to buy, about £50; but she costs nothing for food, clothing, or wages. And she can do those jobs which you find most tiresome—but, I am afraid, she will not help you with your homework!

I am told that in America there is a mechanical man even more perfect than this 'maid.' He will do little tasks when you ask him. He can switch on the electric light, or the fire; he will sit down and stand up just as you order. He can be given his orders by phone. You may ring him up and say, 'I shall be home in an hour, put on the electric fire.' And when you arrive home the fire will be burning.

I should explain, however, that the mechanical man would not obey your voice or mine. He will only obey his master. Another voice has not got the right tone to set his electrical machinery working. That teaches us all a little lesson—have you noticed in how many different tones you can speak to some one you want to do a job for you? But if you use a rough and nasty tone that person is not likely to do it. Like the mechanical man, he will not answer when the wrong tone is used. In a similar way, have you ever noticed how many different ways you can say, 'Coming, mother,' when she calls you to do something for her? It can be an unhappy growl, a sulky whine, a lazy drawl, or a bright and happy response. Use the best tone.

A mechanical servant does sound a good idea, doesn't it? I know I should like one in my home, whether it was one that answered to the right tone of voice, or one that worked without command.

We are reminded by our text that we should be saying to God, in a bright and happy fashion and not in a mechanical way, 'I am Thy servant.' God wants those who will leap willingly and gladly to His service when He calls. I expect you know that Mr. Winston Churchill is busy writing down all that he remembers about the War. The first book, *The Gathering Storm*, was published a good

while ago. Now the second book, *Their Finest Hour*, is being read. In this book Mr. Churchill tells the story of the days when the British Army was on the beaches of Dunkirk. The Germans thought they could destroy it entirely. The Government, however, busily prepared plans to have many large ships bring the men away. When the day came and orders were given to set sail an amazing thing happened—every one who had a boat, whether steam or sail, set out for Dunkirk. When Mr. Churchill went to see the head of the Admiralty Map-Reading Room even that officer was missing—he had left in a small boat for the beaches of Dunkirk. As a result, while high officers thought that it might be possible to save thirty-five thousand men, actually three hundred and thirty-eight thousand two hundred and twenty-six were saved. That is a grand story of people who wanted to serve their country, and just leapt at the opportunity. God wants people who will serve Him as gladly and as eagerly.

A true Christian is a person who serves. He does not live for self, but for others. He knows that he is a follower of Jesus, who left His high estate that He might be a servant of men. These are the things you and I have to remember, because we live in a day when selfishness is growing. But we are to try to find day by day all the things we can do for others.

All over our country the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides have been going from house to house collecting money by doing 'a job for a bob.' There is a lot we can do, from helping our mother to helping our neighbour, and we can do it gladly and eagerly for the sake of Jesus who calls us to love and serve others.

Nothing.

By the Reverend John B. Wilson, Glasgow.

'Be careful for nothing.'—Ph 4^6.

There are a great many apparently simple words which are not easy to explain. Take 'nothing,' for example. It isn't easy to say what nothing is, especially when you remember that nothing is something that is not. Of course, when you put it that way it just sounds silly. But could you explain the meaning of nothing? Perhaps a wise philosopher could; he would make a great deal of nothing and after he had finished few people would be any the wiser. That doesn't mean that you don't know what nothing is; you do, only it is difficult to explain. The trouble is that you don't always mean nothing when you say, 'Nothing.'

Maybe you've been rude to some one and your mother gets to know of it and asks, 'What did you say to Mrs. So-and-So?' Then you look angelically innocent and say, 'Nothing.' Or perhaps you have been misbehaving in some other way; you have nearly been caught, but not quite, yet you have a guilty look and father says, 'What have you been up to?' and, again looking angelically innocent, you reply, 'Nothing.' On such occasions you don't really mean 'nothing,' do you? Your 'nothing' means something so that your 'nothing' is a lie.

Or perhaps, at school this time, you have been inattentive; you haven't been putting your mind to your work; you've been thinking of nothing. So, when you try to do the new problem in arithmetic which the class has just been taught, you get it wrong and round comes teacher and puts a big red O on your exercise book. Here 'nothing' really means ignorance, ignorance that is entirely your own fault and which leads you into error.

Then, too, when a chum has been telling you about something he has done—it may be a prize he has won, a place he has visited, or just some good thing that has happened to him—you say, 'Oh, that's nothing!' But you don't really mean that it is nothing, for it is something you'd like to have happened to you. 'Nothing' then means envy.

In these ways you often make 'nothing' mean an awful lot of things it doesn't usually mean, which, in fact, it does not really mean. You see when you speak like that or act like that you are actually speaking or acting as if you believed that such things as lying, ignorance, and envy are nothing. That is something about which you must be very careful. It wasn't exactly this that the Apostle had in mind when he wrote to the members of the Church in Philippi saying, 'Be careful for nothing.' But you must be careful for nothing as you sometimes mean it. Jesus said that people who thought nothing of certain things were foolish and blind. He was speaking of people who made vows and showed their intention of keeping them by swearing 'by the temple' or 'by the altar.' To Jesus it was a kind of blasphemy, something like taking God's name in vain. But the people who did that sort of thing said, 'It is nothing,' Jesus said that they were foolish and blind.

Thinking nothing of lying, ignorance, and envy, and all the other things of which you think nothing can make you foolish and blind too—foolish because thinking such things is harmful to you, blind because they keep you from seeing the wrongness of them, because they shut your eyes to such things as truth and honesty, your need of learning, and that unselfishness which keeps you from envy. You are taught to believe that Jesus is the Truth, how then can you believe that a lie is nothing? You know that Jesus is a Teacher sent from God, how then can you believe that ignorance is nothing? And Jesus is the Saviour of the world

because He took no thought for Himself, He was completely unselfish, how then can you believe that your envy means nothing? If you would be true and wise and unselfish like Jesus, be careful about those things of which you so often think 'nothing.'

The Christian Year.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

How Christ Becomes Our King.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. RIACH, B.D., EDINBURGH.

'And being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper . . . and she brake the box, and poured it on his head.'—Mk 14^{3}.

'And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, . . . began to wash his feet with tears.'—Lk $7^{37.38}$.

If a study of the Four Gospels be made it will be discovered that there is a story of the anointing of Jesus Christ related in each. To the cursory reader these might appear to be different versions of the same incident, but closer examination reveals such is far from the case. When we turn to Mark's Gospel we find his anointing story is the same as Matthew's. Jesus has a week to live. He is at Bethany. He enters the house of Simon, a leper, whom He had evidently cured of the dread disease. As He sits at dinner in comes an unknown woman bearing a flask of costly ointment and she proceeds to pour the entire contents over Jesus' head. When we turn to Luke's Gospel his anointing story is quite different. Jesus is on a missionary tour of Galilee. He is invited to dine with a man, Simon, a Pharisee. As He sits at meat there comes in a woman bearing in her hands a flask of ointment. Evidently she, too, intends to anoint His head but she never reaches that length. When she sees Jesus, emotion gets the better of her, and when her tears spill over on to the Holy feet she impulsively kneels down and, wiping the tears away with her hair, she proceeds to anoint Jesus' feet as if to cleanse them from the pollution. When we turn to John's Gospel we find his anointing story is different still. Jesus has six days to live. He is at Bethany. He enters the house of Lazarus. As He sits at a meal in comes Mary, the sister of His host, bearing a phial of ointment. She anoints Jesus' feet with the spikenard and immediately begins to wipe it off with her hair—an altogether meaningless act. What has evidently happened is that when writing His Gospel John had Mark's story of the anointing of Jesus' head with ointment, and Luke's narrative of the anointing of Jesus' feet with tears before him for reference, but confused the details to produce a rather meaningless incident. Thus of the four anointing stories related in the Gospels two are really distinct, namely, Mark's narrative of the anointing of Jesus' head and Luke's tale of the anointing of Jesus' feet; but is there not some vital connexion between these two incidents?

1. In Mark's anointing story we are there shown perfectly clearly what Jesus Christ should become to all Christian people. R. L. Stevenson writes: 'To hold the same views at forty you held at twenty is not to rank as a prophet, but as an unteachable brat, who has been well birched by the experience of twenty years and is none the wiser for the birching.' This reveals that a man's attitude to everything, from the love he has to his wife to all the material things of the world, ought to undergo a profound change as he grows older. This is precisely what happened, and required to happen, to the disciples regarding Jesus Christ. Look how John's attitude to Jesus, when He was alive, was one of friendly familiarity. We find him in the Gospels chatting with the Master without embarrassment, allowing his mother to ask the chief place in the Kingdom as if he were not much lower in rank, and leaning on Jesus' bosom at the Last Supper. But when thirty-odd years had passed we find John's attitude to Jesus had completely changed. The John who lies behind the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles is now rather like the seer of Patmos when he says, 'and when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead.' His attitude had altered from that of familiarity to one of reverent adoration and obedience. This is what we discover with Peter and Jude, the brother of Jesus. Their Epistles in the New Testament reveal that their whole attitude to Jesus Christ in later life was vastly different from that of the early days when they knew Him in the flesh.

This is what should happen to us. As we grow older in the Christian Faith our attitude to Jesus Christ ought to be undergoing a profound change. It should not be the same as it was when first we took an independent interest in Christianity, for what is Christ to the beginner in the Christian pilgrimage? To some He is the great unseen Friend and Companion, to others He is the matchless Comforter in time of sorrow, and to others the peerless Teacher in morals and religion. These are the things Christ usually means to the beginners in the Christian Faith and, alas, remains to many of them all the days of their life. But as we grow older Christ should become to us something far profounder than that. We should be making ever new discoveries of the riches that are in Him until He becomes to us the King of Kings—One who commands, rules, dominates our whole life and evokes from us a

passionate devotion because of what we have found Him to be.

This is the message of Mark's anointing story. In the East a king was anointed on his coronation day in token of his kingship. This unknown woman had a flask of ointment worth the yearly income of a labouring man. All the contents she poured lavishly over Jesus' head to tell Him, as no words could, that to her He was no mere friend or comforter or teacher but a King of Kings to whom she would give all the love, obedience, and homage of her being. When the disciples upbraided her for her extravagance no wonder Jesus took her part. What was the waste compared to what the act meant? He was to her a King; and that is what He desires to be to us.

2. But how does Christ ever become that to any man? There must be some experience which moves a man to allow Christ to rule and dominate him like a king. It is here that Luke's anointing story comes in. Simon, a Pharisee, had invited Jesus to dine with him. In came a woman to whom He had also become a King of Kings for she, too, had a box of ointment, evidently intending to anoint His head, but she never got that length. When she caught sight of Jesus, emotion got the better of her; and little wonder. She had been a creature of the streets whom He had redeemed from her terrible way of life. When she saw this man to whom she owed her deliverance, and realized all it spelt, instead of anointing His head as she intended, she caught herself anointing His feet with her tears. Being an impulsive creature she knelt down, took the first thing to hand, her dishevelled hair, to wipe the tears away, kissed His feet passionately and anointed them with the ointment in a mad endeavour to purify them. The self-righteous Simon protested. Everyone knew what this woman had been, and how could Jesus be a Holy Man if He even allowed the ex-harlot to touch Him? Jesus saw His chance and took it. 'Simon, I've something to say to you. Since the moment I entered your door you have insulted Me. All the customary courtesies of our people to guests you have deliberately ignored. No water for washing, no oil for anointing have you attempted to provide. What a contrast you are, Simon, to this woman. Look at her daft, passionate affection for Me. Here is one whom I completely dominate and command. To her I am a King of Kings. Why, Simon? Let me tell you. It is because she knows what the experience of forgiveness is at My hands. How much you need to go through the same experience with your pride and self-righteousness despite your religious profession! Until you do I shall never become a King of Kings to you. To whom little is forgiven, Simon, the same loveth little.'

There is the secret spilled of how Christ becomes a King of Kings to any man. In this untheological age men imagine forgiveness is a mere idea theologians toy with. They do not see the reality that lies behind it. They do not realize forgiveness means a complete crushing of the desire to do evil in them and that their whole nature is reborn. Nor will they take in that every man, whatever his upbringing, needs to go through this experience. And even when such things are plain as a pikestaff to them they shirk this upsetting, transforming experience and are somewhat like Burns of whom Stopford Brooke declares that while like the prodigal he was always coming to himself, when it came to going to the father's house to receive pardon he never got more than half way. To the moral and religious teaching of Christ men are prepared to lend a wistful ear, but they fight shy of the revolutionary experience of forgiveness. This is the reason why Christ is merely the Teacher or Friend or Comforter to so many, and, as Marcus Dods once noticed, Christianity does so little for them. Never, until men understand what forgiveness is and experience it, does Jesus Christ become to them, as He desires to be to all men, the King of Kings who dominates their life.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

He Took Courage and Went.

BY THE REVEREND W. M. BUCHAN, M.A., NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

'Joseph of Arimathæa, a respected member of the council, who was also himself looking for the kingdom of God, took courage and went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus.'—Mk 15^{43} (Revised Standard Version).

Joseph of Arimathæa was a Jewish aristocrat who underwent a personal crisis on the day of Jesus' crucifixion. As a respected member of the council he was rather zealous to maintain the status in which he was held by the people, for he seems to have been at pains to court popularity. He was, no doubt, a gentleman of wealth and comfort who, from a worldly point of view, sailed in even waters, disliking squalls, ruffles, and breezes. His policy of life would probably be characterized as that of avoidance, accepting the pleasant things as they came along and evading the unpleasant. The trouble with him was his conception of the unpleasant which he defined as that which disturbed his world of ease. In short he was a man who endeavoured to be in everyone's good books.

Leading this sort of life a man has to reckon with a price in the realm of personal mal-adjustment. It induces flabbiness of character, timidity,

irresoluteness, tends to atrophy the will, and leaves the individual fearful and nervous. Such a one becomes a prisoner in his own personality system, robbed of freedom and happiness. Such a mode of living does not work.

One of Joseph's major problems arose when he discovered that he was attracted to Jesus Christ. However, if he became an avowed follower of Christ he would have to reckon with the attitudes of his council colleagues as well as his standing in the eyes of his fellow-Jews generally. Perturbed at this dilemma Joseph tried to solve his difficulty by compromise—by becoming a secret disciple. This loyalty he kept as a guarded secret, for outwardly he was recognized as an unconverted Jew, but privately he was a disciple of the Nazarene. He did not wish to be found out, of course, so that when matters pertaining to Jesus came before the council he tried to maintain a neutrality by probably absenting himself from the meeting. At any rate he did not record his vote.

But what a predicament for a man to be in—neither one thing nor another, a person of dual personality, wavering and hesitant, loving Christ on the one hand, and afraid of the Jews on the other hand. His system of avoidances had brought him to a state of anguish, conflict, and tension.

Things came to a head on Good Friday, after Jesus had breathed His last. The bystanders having scattered after their ghoulish sightseeing, Joseph was left with his own thoughts. The bodies of criminals were usually left on their crosses to waste, though the Jews had made a request for the body of Jesus to accelerate a dishonourable destruction. Joseph had an unused tomb, rock-hewn, in his garden. Thoughts raced through his mind, then he determined his course. He, a respected member of the council, went to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus. It was a public act of identification. By this great open avowal he threw in his lot with the Crucified and lodged his protest against the felony of his contemporaries.

St. Mark's version of the occasion is at pains to point out the costliness of this decision, the decisiveness of the turn round, the determination of Joseph. It says he went ' boldly,' he ' ventured,' or as it is put graphically in the Revised Standard Version he ' took courage and went.' In such a phrase there is given to us the picture of a man with his private beliefs who broke through to a great act of courage.

Joseph makes an interesting study in human nature and it is possible to isolate some aspects of his character. There is the phase, for example, when he can be described as frightened into secrecy. Up to a point he had given his heart to the new Teacher and Messiah. Secretly he accepted Him, but the public was not informed. Joseph was no Andrew, Peter, or Matthew. His religious faith was rendered private because of fears he entertained and hostility he might provoke. Otherwise it would have involved an emergence from a sheltered life.

H. V. Morton in his book, *In the Steps of St. Paul*, tells of an interesting sect he encountered in Cyprus, known as ' flax-cottons.' Outwardly they were Muslims but secretly they were Christians. They were descendants of Latin Christians who, in a time of persecution by the Turks, pretended that they were converts to Islam. Through the generations, their sect becoming steadily fewer, they had perpetuated this falseness, all the time bearing secret Christian names, baptised secretly by priests, observing the Orthodox Church fasts in secret, and likewise receiving the Sacrament.

I suppose there are those who would not mind a Christianity of that nature, who would not object to being Christian so long as it was a secret society. Here is the case of a man living in a small town where he knows and is known by everybody. He goes to church occasionally with his wife who is a member of a church noted for its active and joyous religion. The members of this church are recognized by the community as standing for something, hence those who associate themselves in church membership have clearly committed themselves, have become marked individuals. Although the gentleman of our illustration gives his inward assent to this type of religion displayed in the particular church, he, nevertheless, maintains a certain aloofness. Therefore he feels able to associate with his workaday fellows without any clear sense of Christian responsibility. In private conversation he gives nothing away, and even when pressed retorts defensively, ' How do you know I am not a Christian ? '

I suppose it is quite possible in a country where Christianity is the official religion to be a member of a church and yet to fit into the category of secret disciple, for fear of being regarded as peculiar. The religion of Jesus Christ has something to say concerning conduct, speech, business, home, and relationships. The secret disciple is one who accepts a brand of religion which raises no issues and interferes with no habits. It is restricted to private life and public worship.

Such a man is in bondage, at heart a Christian, but inhibited by his social environment, beaten to secrecy through fear.

On Jesus' crucifixion day Joseph's fear gave way to self-reproach. He was shamed to decision. He then recognized clearly that his faint-heartedness was not good enough. The eyes that beheld steadfast heroic endurance were filled with a deep sense of shame, for the Cross provided a turning point. The life of avoidance was no more for him.

How can a person who thinks seriously and imaginatively of Jesus' voluntary suffering for others remain content with a hidden Christianity? The Cross draws us into the open, firing the heart with love and faith and filling us with a sense of shame. For Joseph it struck the death-blow to a life of exemption, made him take sides, and ended an uneasy and unsatisfactory mode of behaviour.

Thus, in the final phase of Joseph's conversion we see him as a mortal fired to a great act of courage—all the more courageous when we note that he threw in his lot with the Crucified when His stock stood at its lowest, when His cause seemed doomed, when the other disciples were broken and scattered. At a moment when it was most difficult he stood in.

An action of this sort often provides incentive for some other timid heart, and it seems to have been so on this occasion. Another member of the council, Nicodemus, who went to see Jesus by night, took his stand with Joseph, bringing his offering of spices as an open tribute to Christ and amid the hostility of the Pharisees.

There is tremendous exhilaration in such daring action with indifference to consequence. It gives a man freedom and power. It is like stepping from a stuffy room on to a wind-swept moor. The overcoming of obstacles and the compunction to take some stand bring to life clarity and resoluteness. It brings self-realization.

So Joseph passed through his testing time and rose to the occasion. I can see others following him—putting some relationship right because of a decision to be an avowed Christian, rebutting a certain offer at work which involves a sub-Christian code, constrained to offer for church membership, moved to some form of public service for Christ.

The Figure on the Cross thus moves us, but as Good Friday was followed by Easter Sunday, so the very same Figure eternally alive approves our present resolves and gives us power of fulfilment.

Joseph of Arimathæa, a respected member of the council, a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews, took courage.

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Divine Forgiveness.

BY THE REVEREND W. POWELL, M.A., B.D., WEST HADDON, RUGBY.

'There is forgiveness with thee.'—Ps 130^4.

What has the Bible to say about the Divine forgiveness?

We read: 'Thou art a God *ready* to pardon.' He never hesitates, never delays; as soon as He finds repentance He pardons. He is slow to anger. Punishment is described as a strange work of His. He does not like it. He does not feel at home in it. He does not feel in His element in it. 'As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways; for why will ye die?' Punishment is a last resource. We are told that God is slow to anger. But we are never told that He is slow to forgive. His forgiveness is as quick as lightning. He needs no persuasion to be merciful. 'If by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.' Because God delights in life, not in death, much more shall life follow from faith than death from unbelief. Again and again Paul says this. There is not a moment between the sinner's repentance and the Divine forgiveness. God does not stop to consider.

> The moment a sinner believes,
> And trusts in his crucified Lord,
> His pardon at once he receives.

How slow we often are to forgive a wrong! How unwilling we are to let go our sense of grievance! How we cherish it! How we chew it in our mouths like a sweet tit-bit! How hard it is to induce many people to shake hands and be friends after a quarrel! We stand on our dignity. We do not as soon as a friend says, 'I am sorry,' reply, 'Then it's all right.' We think it is lowering ourselves to forgive at once. God is not like this. He has a different idea of dignity. As soon as we turn to Him in regret for our sin, He turns to us in absolution. He forgives twice who forgives promptly. God always forgives promptly. In spirit He absolves us before we repent, and He tells us so in order to gain our repentance. 'I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins; return unto me; for I have redeemed thee.' Here is God declaring His forgiveness in spirit before Israel has returned to Him, and on the ground of this forgiveness He calls them to return to Him. He stretches out His hand to take ours, before we are ready to take His.

Again, 'who forgives *all* thine iniquities.' No sin is too great for Him to pardon. We may say about an injury we have suffered from some one, 'I could forgive anything but that. I draw the line there. After all, one must draw the line somewhere. There is a limit to what one can be expected to do in this way.' But God draws the line nowhere. There is no limit with Him. He makes no exception. There is no possible sin to which His pardoning love does not reach. He knows the worst in us, and is prepared to forgive it. The only unforgivable sin is the sin of which the sinner is not able to repent.

God forgives all our iniquities, *however many*

times we repeat them, if only we repent as often. Ezekiel says that however often a man has sinned, whenever he turns from his sin, God is as ready to pardon him as He was after his first offence. He never tires of forgiving. He never says of a penitent, 'It is no use forgiving him; he will go wrong again.' God will give him another chance. 'When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right; if the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life, without committing iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die.' All his bad record shall be ignored. As often as we repent, so often God forgives. Jesus told Peter that we were to forgive seventy times seven; that is a vivid way of saying, 'without end.' And God does not tell us to do a greater thing than He is prepared to do Himself. It is because His pardon is without time-limit that He demands that ours shall be the same.

Look at the thoroughness with which He pardons. 'He will *abundantly* pardon,' 'As far as the east is from the west, so far has he removed our transgressions from us.' Another way in which He puts it is to say that He casts them behind His back; another is that He no longer has them before His mind, no longer thinks of them. The same is meant when He says that He remembers our sins no more. We say sometimes, 'I can forgive, but I cannot forget.' Well, that is not how God forgives. He forgets. Some people, long after they are supposed to have forgiven a thing, will still in a roundabout way refer to it in conversation and do so in a tone which shows that it still rankles in their breast. But once God forgives our sins, He never rakes them up again. He does not mention them any more. The father did not rub it in to the prodigal son on his homecoming about the life he had been living. He did not say a syllable about it, though the elder brother had a lot to say about it. God makes our sins to disappear completely from His mind. It is just as when we find that where a little while ago there was a cloud, even a thick one, there is now nothing but clear blue. Or again, take the ancient use of soft clay tablets for writing. When you wish to obliterate what you have written, you simply smooth out the clay and then no sign, no trace, of what was written is to be seen. It is as though it was never there. So God blots out our evil past.

'Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.' That is, God's ideas about forgiveness and His forgiving ways are as much higher than our ideas of forgiveness and than our forgiving ways as the heavens are higher than the earth.

The master was angry with the unforgiving servant and gave him to the tormentors till he should pay all that was due. 'So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.' The reason why our Father hates an unforgiving spirit so terribly is that it is the opposite of His spirit, which is the spirit of perfect forgiveness.

At Calvary God gets His pardon right across to us. There we see the fullest expression and the mightiest operation of His pardoning love. It is the Cross of Jesus that makes God's pardon fully real to us. We may speak glibly about the Divine forgiveness. But forgiveness is not cheap. It is costly. There is no forgiveness without a cross. Try to forgive one who has badly wronged you, and you will know. It is a tremendous thing that the Holy, Holy One should the moment we repent wash all our stains away in His forgiveness, however deep those stains may be, and all through the shedding of the precious blood of His dear Son. To be cleansed in the blood of the Lamb is an unutterable wonder.

Let us, then, receive our Father's pardon with unspeakable wonder, gratitude, and love. Let us believe with all our hearts that He has pardoned us since He has proved it through the pardoning love of Jesus. And let us receive the Power that can overcome our sin.

One word of warning. Beware of sinning away your power to repent. If any one does this, he cannot receive pardon. Repent and believe without delay.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Deeds not Words.

BY THE REVEREND G. W. H. LOUDON, B.D., S.T.M., CALLANDER.

'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.'—Mt 7^{21}.

It is many years now—to be exact, just over a hundred and sixty—since the folk of Edinburgh were startled and shocked to learn that one of their most respected fellow-citizens was to be hanged for thieving. To them, the name of William Brodie—member of the Town Council, and of many societies, and Deacon of the Incorporated Trades—was a synonym for honesty and

upright dealing. But the same Deacon Brodie, however decent and good living he might appear by day, was by night the leader of a dangerous and skilful gang of robbers; men who had carried out many daring burglaries with success, and who might have escaped detection for long enough, if one of them had not turned against his companions. Even so, there were many who found it hard to believe that the Deacon could have had any hand in such a matter. But the Law had no doubts; and in due course the Deacon was executed, according to the harsh justice of the time.

I expect that the Deacon had been a church-going man. In that age he could not well have been otherwise if he wished to maintain his position and reputation. And I have no doubt that, when his duplicity was finally unmasked, the text which heads this sermon was quoted at more than one Edinburgh fireside.

And yet the Deacon's is not the only kind of character that answers the description which Jesus here gives us; and, indeed, I doubt if he is the best example to give of it. When I set this saying of Christ's alongside other sayings of His that are to the same purpose, I get the very strong impression that Jesus was not speaking about monsters of hypocrisy and iniquity, such as Brodie proved to be, but of quite ordinary people. It is not only the Deacon Brodies and their like whose service of God stops short at words and outward show. It is not they alone who have to be reminded that deeds, not words, are what is required.

1. For one thing, there is the man who does not see that to leave words without deeds to match them can sometimes be a very harmful thing. We see this illustrated often enough in the realm of politics, alike on the individual and on the national level. The promises of the election address have often to wait long enough for their performance; and as the wait grows longer, so the credit grows less of him who made the promise. Again, a plan or programme of industrial revival and national prosperity is still a long way from being achieved when it is issued as a White Paper; but there is a danger for Government to behave as if the stating of a purpose was tantamount to fulfilling it. And you and I often do very much the same kind of thing; and I think we do it most often in the house of God. We come into church, and we sing hymns that are sometimes quite stupendous in the promises they make; and yet how often it appears that these are to us merely the words that happen to accompany that particular tune.

> I'm not asham'd to own my Lord,
> or to defend his cause,
> Maintain the glory of his cross,
> and honour all his laws.

We open our chests to sing that, but do we as often open our hearts to do anything about it? I must confess to feeling a kind of sneaking respect for an old lady, of whom I have heard my parents speak, who resolutely and finally closed her lips whenever she came to the words

> Take my silver and my gold;
> Not a mite would I withhold.

She was *not* prepared to live up to that standard. She knew that she was not. And she saw no reason why she should make matters worse by telling lies about it.

Or again, we come into church, and we join in saying the Lord's Prayer; and familiarity dulls the meaning of the tremendous words, until they evoke no answering response in our lives. But only a very daring or a very dull man can pray 'Thy kingdom come' without being concerned what the consequences may be. As Jerome says, it is a mark of a great boldness, or else of a pure conscience, if a man can pray for the Kingdom and not fear the judgment. But how many of us to-day even remember about the judgment as we say the words?

Words without deeds—that is what such behaviour amounts to; and it cannot fail to be harmful. It is harmful to the Church of Christ; for it does not take the outsider long to realize that here, as elsewhere, there is a discrepancy between promise and performance, and what men may tolerate long enough in politics they will instantly condemn in religion. This kind of behaviour, then, discredits the Church in the outsider's eyes; and that, of course, makes him less likely to come in. So it is harmful to him also, for it is turning him away from the one sure source of true and lasting peace. But most of all it is harmful to ourselves; for it breeds in us the notion—the unexpressed, unformulated, but quite strongly held conviction—that there is no need of a response to the gospel of the living God. But not everyone that saith, 'Lord, Lord,' but he which doeth the will of the Father shall enter into the kingdom of heaven.

2. And we can take the matter farther than that. There are not only times when it is harmful to use words without deeds to match them. There are times when to do that is in a sense impossible; for the absence of the deed means that the word has lost its meaning. It has become only an empty sound, it has ceased to be a word at all.

I can illustrate my meaning here most clearly from the actual language of our text. Jesus is Lord—that is a statement that will always be true. He is Lord over history, Lord over the universe, Lord over all creation. But if I do no more than *call* him Lord, then He is not *my* Lord.

If I do no more than that, I am uttering a meaningless sound. For to call Him Lord is to say that I am His servant, His subject, His slave; and it is the part of slaves and subjects and servants to obey. If I call Him Lord, and do not the things which He says, then I am admitting that either I do not mean what I say, or else I do not know its meaning. And either way, I am admitting that He is not *my* Lord, not *my* God. I am admitting that I do not really know Him.

And this is the point at which this policy of words without deeds reaches its nadir. This is where the sheer necessity of 'deeds not words' becomes apparent. For there is only one way to know the truth about Jesus, and He has not left us in any doubt concerning it. 'He that will do the will—he that is willing to do the will—shall know the doctrine.' He that wills to do the will of the Father which is in heaven will learn the truth about the Son. It is only in this kind of way—the way of active obedience, the way in which I *do something about it*—that I can come to stand before Him whom I see and acknowledge to be my Lord and my God.

3. 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' Deeds, not words—that is what is being required of us. Have you ever wondered why it should be so? Why should Jesus have made these terrific demands from His friends? Why should He insist, as He does insist, on the need of utter, and complete, and unrestrained obedience to Himself? 'Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.' It is a demand for activity—for deeds, not words; but why?

'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . *All things were made by him.*' 'My word . . . shall not return unto me void, but *it shall accomplish* that which I please. . . .' In fact, the Word of God is His deed; and that is true also of the living Word. We do not know God except in His deeds; it is in His activities that He declares Himself to us; and His will for us is that we should become like unto Himself. It is because in doing His will we shall grow into His likeness, that we shall in that way find admittance to His Kingdom—that way, and not by any crying of 'Lord, Lord.' For that is, as we have seen, something we have no right to say, unless our deeds have taught us how to say it.

Yes, and there is something beyond that still. 'For no man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Spirit.' So this also is of God; and the deed in which we obey Him, the deed in which we find the right to acclaim Him, comes from Him, and is His own deed in us.

Evangelism.

Preaching and Pastoral.

By the Reverend James N. Alexander, M.A., Glasgow.

Books innumerable have been written on the work of the modern ministry. Too many begin from the circumference; too few from the centre. The essential *raison d'être* of the Christian ministry, namely, the call to be an evangelist with its sense of mission and urgency, is frequently neglected, or at best soft-pedalled, as not quite in harmony with the times. A new note needs to be struck with the authentic ring of New Testament proclamation—proclaiming with passionate insistency God's Good News to a perishing world.

Dean Inge's description of the modern preacher as a 'spectacle-maker whose job it is to help people with every degree of myopia to see the invisible' does not touch the heart of the matter. We Christian ministers are not primarily 'spectacle-makers' but messengers proclaiming 'an event or the event, God's event,' confronting men with the facts of sin and God's wondrous redemption in Christ Jesus, and forcing their individual souls to an inescapable 'Yes' or 'No.'

Nothing is easier than to be side-tracked from this central aim. It is doubtless true, as Farmer declares that 'the modern man thinks in terms of the world. He opens his newspaper and reads—the world. He goes to the films—and sees the world. He listens to the radio and hears—the world. Almost unconsciously everything is projected on to and takes its dimensions from that vast background. A message which however well intentioned does not contrive to lift men's eyes beyond the limits of their parish or their denomination or even their own individual salvation—crucial as that is—will seem too small to be true.' I agree. We cannot disregard the cosmic note. What passes for 'gospel' preaching with certain

sections is too often a form of pious escapism from harsh and brutal realities in our modern world which impinge disturbingly upon the sensitive Christian mind. If the Christian message has no relevance to social, industrial, national and international issues, it has no relevance at all. Yet eventually the message must be to the individual. The citadel to be taken is a man's own soul.

Too many sermons are like unaddressed envelopes. They are not meant for anybody in particular. They reach no target for they aim at none. The evangelist preacher whose concern is proclamation must keep asking himself: 'At what point or other in their personal experience can I lay hold of these people and bring them face to face with the Word?' Personal encounter must be the climax. That is the profound and enriching idea behind Buber's *I and Thou*—that a sermon is not talking about God in the third person but God Himself speaking in the first person, striving through your message and mine to establish an 'I and Thou' relationship between each individual listener and Himself—by the direct encounter of will with will and personality with personality seeking to force a crisis in the deep inner places of a man's being, bringing him to a decision of acceptance and self-surrender.

Evangelism has become a discredited term savouring too much of hysteria. People we are told are not so emotional as they were before two wars made them tough. Hence evangelistic campaigns by professional evangelists no longer appeal. That is largely true. Perhaps we are erring too much in the opposite extreme, content to appeal to the intelligence alone, sending our hearers home with a more or less neat little parcel of pros and cons, scared of saying one little thing that might be construed as emotionalism or worse. I think that is faulty psychology. Modern man is just man after all—a queer, irrational, self-contradictory jumble of complexes that we call human nature, and the great deeps in his life—the subconscious as well as the conscious self are broken up only when his imagination and emotion are in some way profoundly stirred.

I once heard Donald Fraser say that the younger men in the ministry had lost something in having no first-hand experience of the Moody Revival such as he had. They simply couldn't understand its tremendous impact on plain people's lives. Yet the thing was real. Though some of us now smile at or feel repelled by its crudeness and its jaunty or saccharine hymns and choruses, it was nevertheless the genuine article. A Movement, which left an indelible mark on men like Henry Drummond, George Adam Smith, James Stalker and most of all James Denney, is surely worthy of respectful study and consideration.

To us with our vastly different background—cultural and emotional—it doesn't explain itself. It seems too simple. It ignores too much. And yet I wonder if it was really so simple. Perhaps it was more profound and subtle than all our ingenious devices for holding men's wandering minds and wavering souls.

For the recovery of our lost evangelism I would submit one or two suggestions:

(1) **Let the Minister be His Own Evangelist.** The practice, formerly so much in vogue, of calling in the evangelist (so called) to take over in pressing a personal appeal, inevitably tends to set up a false antithesis in the average person's mind, as though evangelism in the proper meaning of the term, were a thing outwith a normal and settled ministry.

(2) **Let the Bible Speak.** To ensure that the evangel shall be plainly heard we must re-assert the primacy of the self-authenticating Word of God. Our message is God's message, not man's. Much modern preaching, as it seems to me, is rootless because it is not the Bible that speaks but some weak, spineless, human substitute woven out of the preacher's own theorizing. A return to the old-fashioned, simple, straightforward exposition of Scripture, handled boldly and with insight and imagination, is long overdue. The Bible shines by its own light.

> It gives a light to every age;
> It gives, but borrows none.

(3) I would suggest further that without narrowing its scope or variety in any way **our preaching should be more Christological.** I recall how as a very young man after conducting two services in a city church I was somewhat taken aback when the minister's wife remarked: 'Both texts—did you realize—were taken from the Old Testament and somehow I never once caught a glimpse of Christ Himself.' 'We would see Jesus' was the request of the Greeks to Philip. To show Him forth we must 'placard' Him, to use Paul's own startling phrase in Gal 1^3: make Him the centre of the picture; set His image before men's eyes, in His majesty and meekness, His winsome, gracious, compassionateness; His strange, mysterious, awesome power to probe and search the innermost secrets of the human heart. The sermons that live are the sermons that make Christ live. One glimpse of the living Christ will do more to win men's souls than all our persuasions, however convincing and sound.

(4) For the recovery of our lost evangelism **we must strike the deep redemptive notes.** This is far from easy in our day when words like 'propitiation,' 'ransom,' 'justification' have more or less lost their meaning for the average hearer.

Our approach calls for less theological terminology; simpler, more understandable expression is wanted. But our mandate is clear—'We preach Christ crucified.' There is probably nothing so unmodern as the doctrine of the Atonement that 'Christ died for our sins.' Modern man will listen to you if you speak of his frustrations; he squirms at the mention of sin—that is, in the theological sense. Social evil, that is, wrong done to others, he understands. But evil done to God is something he does not understand. There is one point, however, where you may touch him. As Professor D. M. Baillie puts it: 'He is a man secretly sick of his unworthy past, but he does not know what to do with it and therefore cannot face it.' Far more often than we imagine the man in our pews, in the deepest part of him, is a wounded man—wounded with resentments, grudges and sometimes bitter hates—some of them respectably veiled, others not so, and he does not know what to do with them. Consciously or unconsciously he is in a sad tangle: he finds himself incapable of forgiving others, he cannot forgive himself and judging by his experience of other men, he expects little forgiveness from them. To that condition in people to-day we must address ourselves with power and urgency. When such needs are laid bare and the sheer desperateness of their human tangle is revealed, the word of the Cross begins to have new meaning. Calvary becomes luminous. In spite of themselves men are gripped and held and strangely moved by the spectacle of a Divine forgiveness which cancels every debt and wipes out every sin. Again and again I have noticed that the direct and forthright proclamation of the Cross has a subduing, liberating, life-changing power out of all proportion to a man's gifts.

(5) **Evangelism—Pastoral.** How a minister can be his own evangel and carry it effectively into his day-to-day visitation of his parishioners has become a perplexing problem. The relationship between minister and people has undergone a deteriorating change. The minister's visit is no longer the 'occasion' it once was; it is for many people little more than a social call, carrying with it no special importance. While welcoming the freer and franker contacts of this new relationship, for we *do* see our people without pose or pretence, is there not a real danger of the minister's unique vocation being lost sight of—even by himself? Do we clergy not succumb too easily to this unconscious, social pressure? I must confess such misgivings trouble me. I have often come from visiting a home feeling oppressed by the futility of my visit, wondering what purpose it served. As the shepherd of men's souls did I accomplish anything? Did I seriously try? That 'something different' that should go with an Ambassador of the King, was it there? No one would suggest that a minister should visit his people with his 'mind at church,' uninterested in mundane affairs, still less that he should become a praying machine, conducting devotions in every home he visits. We frequently complain that the modern minister is no longer the centre of his people's lives, he is scarcely even on the circumference. Are we ourselves not partly to blame? As a young minister I did not know as I now know that there is in people's hearts at times when we least expect it, and in very unlikely people at that, a hunger for that touch of the Spirit which should come through you and me. Instead of a rebuff it would meet with welcome and genuine gratitude. A young doctor of my acquaintance had an elderly lady among his patients who was very ill and whose recovery was likely to be difficult. He chanced to ask if her minister knew of her illness. She hardly thought so. The doctor mentioned it to her minister. On his next visit he asked if her minister had been to see her. 'Yes,' she said, 'he did call and he left without a word of prayer.' Had this been a raw beginner—young, inexperienced, diffident and reluctant to impose himself—there might be some excuse. But he was one of the older men. Said my doctor friend, 'I could not fail to register the look of disappointment on this woman's face. Why,' he continued. 'don't ministers do their job as I do mine? They have as important a part to play in the patient's recovery as I have.' There is an interesting field of opportunity here worth studying. Medical science on all sides is stressing the psychological aspects of physical and mental ailments. Doctors may not be better churchmen than they used to be, but on the whole they are far more sympathetic to the spiritual approach. How far and in what ways doctor and minister can co-operate is not an easy question. There are practical difficulties. The fact remains, however, that the Christian ministry is and should be a healing ministry. No one will dispute the fact that there are ill people in all our congregations who need the minister much more than they need the doctor. The malady is spiritual. It may be sin unconfessed, the burden of fear, bewilderment and a feeling of sheer inadequacy for living, or loneliness or estrangement, a deeply rooted resentment against some one or something.

What technique are we ministers devising to deal with such people? I am not suggesting that we take over the rôle of the psychiatrist—although some knowledge along this line would be helpful. But long before any one ever heard of psychiatry the older ministers were doing this job and doing it well.

You may say that the minister to-day lacks the

authority of these older days, but in spite of everything we still have a privileged position. People *do* confide in us. When illness comes *we* have the right of entry. When shattering bereavement falls *we* are sent for. We do stand in a unique relationship. Just how we handle such moments when the deep need of the human soul is laid bare is our glory or our reproach.

We alone have the answer that is big enough and deep enough, and divine enough to help men keep their feet. And what is this but evangelism carried right into the home ?

Recent Foreign Theology.

Ezekiel. In the recently started series of French studies, entitled 'Witnesses of God,' the tenth volume has now appeared. This is devoted to *Ezekiel*,[1] and is by Paul Auvray, who was previously known to the reviewer only as the translator of Ricciotti's *History of Israel* from Italian into French. He has now given us a brief survey of the ministry of Ezekiel, followed by an estimate of his personality and influence on later writers, including Daniel and the author of the Apocalypse. So much has been written on Ezekiel in recent years, and such widely varying theories of the origin of the book that bears his name have been propounded that the writer of even a short general exposition must define his attitude to the critical problems involved. The author is sufficiently influenced by some recent writers to accept the view that Ezekiel began his ministry in Jerusalem and later continued it in Babylonia. In working out this view, however, he takes a way all his own. He holds that Ezekiel journeyed to Babylonia in obedience to the Divine command (Ezk $3^{11.\ 14f.}$) in the thirteenth year after the exile of Jehoiachin, in which year he received his second inaugural vision, which now stands in ch. 1. This chapter he would accordingly transfer to its chronological place between chs. 33 and 34, and he would read 'in the thirteenth year' in 1, instead of 'in the thirtieth year.' He believes the vision of the Valley of Dry Bones (ch. 37) followed very shortly after the second inaugural vision. In contrast to several recent writers, he accepts the concluding chapters (40–48) as the genuine work of Ezekiel, but he holds that here and elsewhere in the book Ezekiel's work has received additions at the hands of copyists, though these are not specified. For the justification of these positions we are referred to a future commentary, on whose preparation the author is engaged. He holds that Ezekiel could write fine poetry, but that normally he wrote a rather diffuse prose. A very brief bibliography is attached to the book, containing works of Hölscher, Hermann and Cooke, but it is surprising to find no mention of Herntrich—who has probably exercised a greater influence over others than any of these —or of Bertholet—whose views have not a little in common with Auvray's—or of several other recent authors. The fall of Nineveh is surprisingly assigned to the year 609 B.C., but no reason is offered to support this.

Almost simultaneously with Auvray, a Belgian writer, A. van den Born, has published a brief study of *The Historical Situation of Ezekiel's Prophetic Work*, written in Flemish, but with a French summary.[2] The writer's views show a striking similarity to those of Auvray. He first reviews the different opinions on the Book of Ezekiel advanced in recent years by Hölscher, Torrey, Smith, Herntrich, Bertholet, Cooke and Messel,[3] and then examines the difficulties in the way of the traditional view that Ezekiel's ministry was wholly exercised in Babylonia. Finally he presents his own positions, which may be briefly outlined as follows : Ezekiel lived and prophesied in Jerusalem until 586 B.C., when he followed the exiles to Babylonia, and there encouraged them and purified their faith, and set before them a programme for the reform of their religion. His ministry in Jerusalem was later forgotten, and the book of his prophecies was arranged in a misleading way, and editorially glossed. Van den Born accordingly rearranges the book as follows : 2^{3}–3^{9} ; $3^{16b\text{-}21}$; 3^{24}–24^{27} ; 25–32 ; 1^{1}–2^{2}, $3^{12\text{-}15}$; $3^{16a.\ 22f.}$; $37^{1\text{-}14}$; 33^{1}–48^{35}. He also gives a list of the glosses which he treats as secondary, and which are few in number. It will be seen that van den Born puts the vision of ch. 1 at the beginning of the Babylonian ministry, as Auvray does, and transfers the vision of ch. 37 to follow this. He differs, apart from details, only in assigning ch. 33 to the Babylonian ministry.

---

[1] *Ezéchiel* (Témoins de Dieu, 10) [1947]. Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris ; Blackfriars Publications, Oxford Fr. 130.

[2] *De historische situatie van Ezechiels prophetie* (Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, Fasc. 2), Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges, [1947].

[3] Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lviii. [June, 1947], 248. Like Messel, van den Born seems to be unacquainted with Irwin's book, *The Problem of Ezekiel* [1943].

The Hope of Christ in the Old Testament. A Dutch Reformed minister, Dr. A. H. Edelkoort, published in 1941 a large volume on the Hope of Christ in the Old Testament.[1] In his Preface he explains why he has chosen this title rather than the 'Messianic Hope.' It is because the term Messiah is connected rather with the idea of King, while Christ is associated rather with the idea of Saviour. He first asks whether the sources of the hope can be found in Egypt or Babylonia, and answers in the negative, claiming that it arose out of Israel's own life. In particular he rejects the idea that the Biblical thought of the kingship of God was an adaptation of a Babylonian idea, or that the psalms that have been connected by some with an assumed *Thronbesteigungsfest* have any connexion with such a festival. He then settles down to a historical survey of the passages of the Old Testament that have been given a messianic interpretation, in the widest sense of the word messianic. That is to say, all the eschatological passages that look to the horizons of time, or that speak of the coming Golden Age, are here brought under survey, whether they appear to envisage a personal leader or not.

Dr. Edelkoort is generally conservative in his outlook, though not wholly so on questions of literary criticism. He treats of passages in Genesis as evidence of patriarchal times, and many psalms he ascribes to pre-exilic times. It is true that many scholars to-day allow that there may be a large pre-exilic element in the Psalter, but it is less easy to specify with precision which ones are pre-exilic in the way Dr. Edelkoort feels able to—if only because the pre-exilic psalms have reached us through post-exilic editors. But Deutero-Isaiah is assigned to the exilic age, and Daniel to the second century B.C., and some post-exilic psalms are treated.

Passages like Gn 49^{10} and the Immanuel passage in Is 7 are carefully studied, and much space is given to the Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah. No adventurous solutions are anywhere advanced, but nowhere has Dr. Edelkoort ignored the adventurous solutions that others have put forward, and his book is of value, if only for its excellent survey of the discussions. On the Servant Songs, he accepts the common delimitation of the four Songs, rejects the collective interpretation, maintains that no individual historical person earlier than the prophet can fit the songs, and that the autobiographical view is also unsatisfactory, and finishes by defending the messianic interpretation. The reviewer would go a long way with him, though he does not think the solution is quite so simple as that, and he deplores the deletion of the inconvenient word 'Israel' in Is 49^{3}. A single MS. lacks the word, and its presence is supported by the versions and by metrical considerations. Without it the line is reduced to 3 : 2, and while such catalexis is not rare, there is no call to introduce it into a perfectly regular line.

The final chapter reviews the New Testament use of the messianic passages of the Old. Altogether Dr. Edelkoort has produced a valuable and scholarly book, whose value lies less in the interpretations offered than in its survey of the history of interpretation, and especially of modern interpretation, and whether the reader shares the author's conclusions or not, he will have much to learn from him.

H. H. ROWLEY.

Manchester University.

[1] *De Christus-verwachting in het Oude Testament.* Wageningen : Veenman & Zonen.

Contributions and Comments.

The Jews in the Fourth Gospel.

IN an article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES [December 1948] on 'The Cleansing of the Temple in St. John's Gospel' Professor R. H. Lightfoot discussed 'the part taken in the record by the Jews, particularly in their relation to the Lord.' After pointing out that 'the frequent occurrence of the expression in this gospel is itself remarkable,' he concludes that 'usually it is "the Jews," rather than any particular section or party within the Jewish nation, who engage in discussion or controversy with the Lord.' A close analysis, however, of the Evangelist's usage points to a different conclusion.

What we may call the normal New Testament meaning of the word *Ioudaios*, 'a Jew,' is a member of the Chosen People, the worshippers of Jehovah, the nation of Israel, as distinguished from all other nations. This denotation is invariable in St. Paul's writings: he uses the word twenty-six times in all, and every time to mean 'Israelite,' Jew as opposed to Gentile; and the same is true of the seventy-nine references in Acts, and also the two in the Apocalypse.[1] The

[1] The non-Pauline Epistles do not use the word.

ynoptists, too, support this usage, although the ew-Gentile antithesis was not in the life-time of ur Lord the burning issue that it subsequently ecame. In fact, the word is extremely infrequent n the Synoptic Gospels : Mark six times, Matthew nd Luke five times each, totalling sixteen times n ninety pages of *The Oxford Greek Testament.* n the Fourth Gospel, however, it is frequent sixty-nine times in twenty-six and a half pages). his contrast is greatly heightened when it is dded that, of the sixteen Synoptic occurrences, ive come from the Marcan Passion Narrative, lways in the phrase 'King of the Jews,' and six more from the parallels. This also accounts for ix of John's references, and the choice of word is bviously dictated by tradition, not due to the preferences of the Evangelists. Of the remaining ive Synoptic occurrences, Mk 7^{3} is an explanatory note for Gentile readers ; Mt 2^{2} gives us 'King of the Jews' again ; Mt 28^{15} opposes Jews to Christ-ans ; Lk 7^{3} contrasts Jews with the (Gentile) centurion ; and Lk 23^{51} is a topographical note for Gentiles. Thus the Synoptists do not appear to need the word for normal occasions ; but the Fourth Gospel, treating of the same events, uses the word more frequently than any other book of the New Testament: 2·6 times per page, against Acts 2·2 ; the Pauline writings, which come next, only once in two pages. Gentiles play no greater part in the Fourth Gospel than in the Synoptists ; why this emphasis on the Jews ?

Looking more closely at the Evangelist's usage of the word, we find that eighteen of the sixty-nine occurrences bear the normal New Testament meaning. These include a number of explanatory notes for non-Jewish readers, such as we noted above in Mark, for example, 'Now the passover, *a feast of the Jews*, was at hand' ($2^{6.\ 13}$ 5^{1} 6^{4} 7^{2} 11^{55} $19^{40.\ 42}$). Three times in ch. 4 (*vv.*$^{9.\ 22}$) it means Jews as contrasted with Samaritans ; and there are the six occurrences noted above of 'the King of the Jews,' to which may be added Pilate's 'Am I a Jew ?' (18^{35}). In all these cases the meaning is unquestionably 'Israelite' ; but some are editorial notes, and the others give the Evangelist no choice of word ; and these are only a quarter of the occurrences.[1] In many cases the 'normal' meaning does not fit the context, and a narrower sense seems to be demanded. For example, the opponents of our Lord in chs. 5–10 are not called 'Jews' to distinguish them from any Gentile hearers, for there are none.

A clue to this narrower meaning is found in 7^{1} : 'And after these things Jesus walked in Galilee ; for he would not walk in Judæa, because "the Jews" sought to kill him.' Obviously here 'the Jews' means the inhabitants of Judæa, the Judæans.[2] An exact analogy occurs at 11^{7} : 'Then after this he saith to the disciples, Let us go into Judæa again. The disciples say unto him, Rabbi, the Jews were but now seeking to stone thee ; and goest thou thither again ?' In each case, to give 'the Jews' a wider meaning than 'men of Judæa' would make nonsense of the passage. Does the word, then, mean 'Judæans' in the remaining forty-nine occurrences ? Investigation shows that, in nearly all, the word is used of men explicitly or implicitly connected with Jerusalem ; while a few are doubtful, allowing either wide or narrow sense.

The following are the passages concerned :

1^{19}. The meaning here must be 'the authorities at Jerusalem.'

$2^{18.\ 20}$. The scene is set in Jerusalem.

$5^{10.\ 15.\ 16.\ 18}$. Again in Jerusalem. Though the controversy is Sabbatarian, no contrast with Gentiles is intended.

$7^{11.\ 13.\ 15.\ 35}$. Again in Jerusalem. Now defined as equivalent to 'them of Jerusalem' (*v.*^{25}) and 'the chief priests and the Pharisees' (*v.*^{32}).

$8^{22.\ 31.\ 48.\ 52.\ 57}$. Continuation of ch. 7 ; no fresh data.

$9^{18.\ 22}$. Equivalent to 'Pharisees' (*vv.*$^{13.\ 15.\ 16}$).

$10^{19.\ 24.\ 31.\ 33}$. Still in Jerusalem.

$11^{19.\ 31.\ 33.\ 36.\ 45.\ 54}$. 'Bethany was nigh unto Jerusalem . . . and many of the Jews had come' (*vv.*$^{18.\ 19}$), *i.e.*, inhabitants of Jerusalem.

In *v.*^{54} Jesus departs from 'among the Jews . . . into the country,' *i.e.*, He left the neighbourhood of Jerusalem.

$12^{9.\ 11}$. Back at Bethany, near enough for 'the Jews' to come.

13^{33}. 'As I said unto the Jews' refers to 8^{21} (see above).

The inquiry has revealed that, though in chs. 11 and 12 the word covers the whole population of Jerusalem, what the writer usually has in mind is the ruling party, the chief priests and the Pharisees. Apart from the few isolated editorial notes mentioned above, this sense predominates in chs. 1–13. In the Passion Narrative the distinction is not so clear-cut.

$18^{12.\ 14.\ 31.\ 36.\ 38}$. All tend to the narrower meaning, though not absolutely requiring it ; *v.*^{20} rather suggests the whole nation.

$19^{7.\ 12.\ 14}$. Identified with 'the chief priests and the officers' (*v.*^{6}).

In *v.*^{20} 'Jerusalemites' in general are meant, and in *v.*^{21} the Jewish nation ; *vv.*$^{31.\ 38}$ and 20^{19} suggest the narrower sense.

In view of the strong evidence of the rest of the

[1] In 1^{47} 'Israelite' is used for a favourable reference to a Jew.

[2] The Greek can bear wider or narrower sense equally well.

Gospel, it seems probable that 'Judæans' is meant, except in 18^{20} and $19^{20.\ 21}$.

We are left with four instances, in chs. 3 and 6.[1] In ch. 3, it is impossible to decide between 'Judæans' and 'Israelites'; *v.*[1] is located in Jerusalem, *v.*[25] in Judæa.

In ch. 6, we have an argument taking place at Capernaum (*v.*[59]), but its tone is exactly like that of the controversies with 'Judæans' in chs. 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Since the word nearly always means 'Judæans' in this Gospel, especially when used absolutely, it seems that the note about Capernaum must be wrong. It is the only case of the word being applied to Galileans. Even the more conservative scholars have felt that ch. 6 is misplaced; and it may well be that a discussion which actually took place in Jerusalem has been appended to a Galilean miracle which illustrates its chief saying, 'I am the bread of life.' The editor, as we have seen, uses the word in the normal sense in his notes, and has left it here in a quite inappropriate context.

Thus we conclude that 'the Jews' in the Fourth Gospel whom the Evangelist regards with such hostility are not the Jewish nation as a whole. For him the word has a special association with Jerusalem; it means Judæans as opposed to Galileans. Professor Lightfoot himself hints at this antithesis when he speaks of our Lord's *positive* work in Galilee and His *negative* revelation at Jerusalem, but he does not press it. This inquiry has shown that 'the Jews' are dwellers in Jerusalem; sometimes, as in chs. 11 and 12, the active population of the city, to whom the Evangelist is not unfriendly; but more often, the chief priests and the Pharisees, whom he depicts as our Lord's bitterest opponents. The indictment is not drawn against the whole Jewish nation but against its religious leaders. The choice of the word 'Judæans' to describe them strongly suggests that the Evangelist was a Galilean.

This interpretation of *Ioudaios* is supported by the Evangelist's use of the word 'Judæa,' which occurs seven times,[2] always contrasted with Galilee, and never meaning 'the whole of Palestine.' So also with Mark's four instances and Matthew's eight (three of them Marcan parallels). Luke-Acts, on the other hand, is divided: eight times meaning Judah (one a Marcan parallel); fourteen times meaning Palestine (notably in his favourite phrase 'all Judæa'). Paul's four references are neutral, with a slight bias towards the Palestine sense. Thus in limiting Judæa to the country round Jerusalem, John is consistent with his usage of 'the Jews,' and has the support of both Matthew and Mark.

G. J. CUMING.

Burnley, Lancs.

[1] $3^{1.\ 25}$ $6^{41.\ 52}$.

[2] 3^{22} $4^{3.\ 47.\ 54}$ $7^{1.\ 3}$ 11^{7}.

The Text of Luke xxiv. 34.

THE question of the text of Lk 24^{34} is raised again in a note by the Rev. B. Kingston Soper in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for December 1948.

Whether the Western Text is the result of a revision by Luke himself or not (see the note by the Rev. W. B. Sedgwick in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May 1948) much can be said for the reading λέγοντες (D) in Lk 24^{34}. The announcement that 'the Lord is risen indeed' would come naturally from the Two Disciples who have just returned to Jerusalem after their amazing experience.

That this reading of Codex Bezae (which appears to have the support of some of the ancient versions) involves that Peter was one of the Two Disciples is to my mind most improbable. When the Two had seen the Risen Lord together it is most unlikely that they would make mention of His appearance to *one* of them, even though that one was Peter himself.

The natural announcement for them to make would be: 'The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to *us*.' Loisy has suggested that this was the original reading (ὤφθη ἡμῖν instead of ὤφθη Σίμωνι). He thinks 'Simon' may have been substituted for 'us' to remove any contradiction between Luke's story and 1 Co 15^{5}.

Perhaps a conjecture may be permitted. A theory of deliberate substitution would be unnecessary if we could think that the declaration of the Two Disciples ran thus: 'The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to us as to Simon' (ὤφθη ἡμῖν ὡς Σίμωνι). It is possible that they had just heard of the appearance to Simon on their return to Jerusalem. The conjecture involves, of course, that the words ἡμῖν ὡς have dropped out of the original text. An early scribe may easily have omitted them by accident, especially as five of the six letters are the letters of the name Simon.

The words καὶ αὐτοί in *v.*[35] do not tell against the nominative λέγοντες in *v.*[34]. As Wellhausen puts it, the accusative λέγοντας 'is not confirmed by καὶ αὐτοί which in Luke never has the meaning "they in their turn."' Repeatedly in the New Testament, and not least in the Lucan writings, both καὶ αὐτός and καὶ αὐτοί are employed in narrative without any emphasis. There are several instances in this very chapter.

J. HUGH MICHAEL.

Emmanuel College, Toronto.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

POSTAL TUITION

FOR THE LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D.

& M.Th. DEGREES; DIPLOMA IN THEOLOGY

London University degree examinations are open to all. University residence is unnecessary. Candidates may read at home; those over 23 may take the shorter Special Entrance, instead of the Matriculation, Examination.

Many ministers have secured London B.A., B.D. & M.Th. degrees through entrusting their entire preparation to Wolsey Hall. In the hands of experienced and sympathetic graduate tutors home study becomes a pleasure. Fees are moderate, and may be spread over the period of the Course. Moreover, should you be compelled to suspend or discontinue the Course, for *any* reason, *no* further instalments are payable beyond those due at the time. In the event of failure, tuition is continued *free of charge*.

LONDON UNIVERSITY B.D. (EXTERNAL) 1948:

WOLSEY HALL

STUDENTS OBTAINED

1 of the 2 FIRST-CLASS HONOURS

and 5 of the 8 Second-Class Honours; in all, OVER HALF THE 'HONOURS' LIST

WOLSEY HALL STUDENTS ALSO FORMED THE ENTIRE 'PASS' LIST

PROSPECTUS FREE

Write for Prospectus, mentioning the examination which interests you. You may obtain a copy, without incurring the least obligation, from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 41,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

PROPRIETORS: DIPLOMA CORRESPONDENCE COLLEGE, LTD.

Three Ever-Useful Series

Edited by Dr. JAMES HASTINGS

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE BIBLE

Twenty Volumes and Index Volume.

'Of Dr. Hastings' various enterprises this is certainly one of the most useful to men faced with the necessity of frequent and regular sermon production.'—*Christian World.*

'The "Great Texts," are excellently expounded, illustrated and driven home.'—*Record.*

Price for set of 20 volumes . . **£9** net.
Index Volume . . . . **7s.** „
Any four volumes (no duplicate) **36s.** „
Less than four . . each **11s. 6d.** „

THE GREATER MEN AND WOMEN OF THE BIBLE

Six Volumes.

'The chief characters are described with such fullness that no sermon upon them need lack apt quotation and illustration, or sound exegesis.'
Preacher's Magazine.

Price for set of six volumes . **54s.** net
Single volumes . each **11s. 6d.** „

THE GREAT CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES

Three Volumes Published

Prayer. *Out of print at present.*

Faith. 'A vital doctrine. No preacher is serving his congregation worthily who does not periodically treat the theme as it is treated here, systematically and comprehensively.'—*Irish Presbyterian.*
14s. net.

Peace. 'The treasures of a vast library have been ransacked and displayed in such a way that preachers can use them to help their congregations.'—*Theology.*
11s. 6d. net.

38 GEORGE STREET
EDINBURGH 2

T. & T. CLARK

THE SCOTTISH PRAYER BOOK

By A. C. DON — *32 pages and 12 plates* — **6s. 6d.**

The Dean of Westminster has collected a number of unusual photographs illustrating the history of the Scottish Prayer Book. Round them he has written this fascinating and scholarly study which will be of enthralling interest to many outside the ranks of the Scottish Episcopal Church ; to the members of that Church, naturally, it will prove especially valuable.

RICHARD HOOKER AND CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL IDEAS

By F. J. SHIRLEY, M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A. — **14s. 6d.**

This study of the " poor, obscure English priest " will be of great interest and value to students of history, political theory, and theology. The book contains a detailed discussion of the vexed problem of the authenticity of the seventh book of the Ecclesiastical Polity. In the last chapter the author deduces from the premises of Hooker what would be his position in answering the questions of disestablishment and reunion with non-episcopal churches.

MARCION AND HIS INFLUENCE

By E. C. BLACKMAN — **12s. 6d.**

Mr. Blackman, in this scholarly and well-documented study, considers, from the dispassionate viewpoint of to-day, Marcion's work as the organiser of a Christian Church, as Biblical critic, canon-maker, textual emendator, and theologian. He has attempted to trace the effect of Marcion's work in the larger context of Catholic Christianity, and presents an estimate of Marcion's significance in the history of Christianity.

THE LIFE OF T. B. STRONG
Bishop, Musician, Dean, Vice-Chancellor

By HAROLD ANSON, Master of the Temple — **8s. 6d.**

This is a book about Victorian Oxford, just when the old clerical Dons were vanishing and a new type was emerging. T. B. Strong was one of the most brilliant and amusing personalities of his day in Oxford University life ; a leader among new and brilliant Liberal High Churchmen, and a keen and competent musician.

TERTULLIAN'S TREATISE AGAINST PRAXEAS

By E. EVANS — **21s.**

This is an edition of the Latin Text fully annotated, and with a new translation appended. It is designed for students and should be a valuable contribution to the resources of scholarship.

CAPTIVE IN BABYLON

BY MANASSES — **2s. 9d.**

There are certain books, small, as well as great, which become spiritual classics, even though their initial appeal is limited. This small book deserves the attention of any priest engaged in directing souls, or any Christian consciously called to the devout life.

THINK AGAIN

By GORDON W. IRESON — **2s.**

This book is a direct challenge to the Christian who goes to church only to make use of the Occasional Offices. It shows how complete a change in our conventional notions is required to accept the Christian Gospel.

S.P.C.K.

NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C.2

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post.* *Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 16s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£7. 7s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*